DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 298 JC 810 241

AUTHOR Boyer, Ernest L.; Levine, Arthur
TITLE A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education. A Carnegie Foundation Essay.
INSTITUTION Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 77p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($6.95).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Educational History; *Educational Objectives; Educational Trends; Elective Courses; *General Education; *Human Relations; Outcomes of Education; *Postsecondary Education; Program Content; Social Organizations

ABSTRACT

The five chapters in this monograph discuss current issues in general education. Chapter I examines the weakness of general education programming, comparing general education to a spare room that has no agreed upon function. Chapter II notes the recent surge of interest in general education; examines the variety of social and educational problems general education is being called upon to solve; and compares this resurgence of interest with two earlier general education movements in the 20th century. Drawing upon this historical analysis, Chapter III argues that the fundamental rationale for general education lies in the need to help students in today's fragmented society understand the human community to which they are accountable. Chapter IV critically examines current general education practices in terms of: course content; the place of general education in the curriculum; and the information, attitudes, and values students are expected to acquire through general education courses. Finally, Chapter V proposes a structure for general education curricula based on six areas of shared human experience: language, membership in groups and institutions, the activities of production and consumption, the scientific workings of the natural world, history, and the development of values and beliefs. Chapter V also discusses alternative delivery systems for general education and the receptiveness of students and faculty to increased general education programming. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200298

A CARNEGIE FOUNDATION ESSAY

A QUEST FOR COMMON LEARNING

THE AIMS OF GENERAL EDUCATION

ERNEST L. BOYER & ARTHUR LEVINE

THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

JC 810241

"PERMISSION TO REPPODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Verne A. Stadtman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Copyright © The Carnegie Foundation
for the Advancement of Teaching

This essay is published as part of an effort to present significant information and issues in education for public discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors. They should not necessarily be ascribed to persons whose review of the manuscript is acknowledged in the Preface or to members of the Research Review Board, individual officers and Trustees, or the Board of Trustees of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Copyright under International, Pan American, and Universal Copyright Conventions. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form—except for brief quotation (not to exceed 1,000 words) in a review or professional work—without permission in writing from the publishers.

Copies are available from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

LC 81-66307
ISBN 0-931050-19-9

Designed by Julian Waters, Bookmark Studio

Manufactured in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Preface
vii

I. The Tale of the Spare Room
1

II. A Succession of Revivals
5

III. General Education: A Room with a Purpose
17

IV. A Look at Current Practice
23

V. A Proposal
25

APPENDICES

Appendix A:
Historical Purposes of General Education
53

Appendix B:
The Structure and Content of General Education
61

Notes
65

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ELIAS BLAKE, JR., *Chairperson*
President
Clark College

F. SHELDON HACKNEY, *Vice Chairperson*
President
University of Pennsylvania

LAWRENCE A. CREMIN
President
Teachers College
Columbia University

ALONZO CRIM
Superintendent of Schools
Atlanta City Schools

WILLIAM R. DILL
Dean, Graduate School of Business Administration
New York University

NELL P. EURICH
Senior Consultant
International Council for Educational Development

DANIEL J. EVANS
President
The Evergreen State College

JOHN T. FEY
Chairman of the Board
The Equitable Life Assurance Society

ROBBEN FLEMING
President
Corporation for Public Broadcasting

NORMAN C. FRANCIS
President
Xavier University of Louisiana

LESLIE KOLTAI
Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College District

MARIGOLD LINTON
Professor of Psychology
The University of Utah

RICHARD W. LYMAN
President
The Rockefeller Foundation

MARY PATTERSON MCPHERSON
President
Bryn Mawr College

FRANK NEWMAN
President
University of Rhode Island

ROBERT O'NEIL
President
University of Wisconsin

ALAN PIFER
President
Carnegie Corporation of New York

LAUREN B. RESNICK
Co-Director, Learning Research & Development Center
University of Pittsburgh

FRANK H. T. RHODES
President
Cornell University

TOMAS RIVERA
Chancellor
University of California, Riverside

GEORGE L. SHINN
Chairman of the Board
First Boston Corporation

ADELE SIMMONS
President
Hampshire College

VIRGINIA B. SMITH
President
Vassar College

BARBARA UEHLING
Chancellor
University of Missouri—Columbia

ERNEST L. BOYER
President

PREFACE

HIGHER education in America is a sprawling enterprise and, in their eagerness to respond to new demands, many of America's colleges and universities have lost a sense of their own expectations. The mission of higher education has become muddled.

Bombarded with a never-ending series of management crises, campuses also have become mired in talk of demographics and enrollment projections, budgeting and cost accounting, collective bargaining and litigation. These concerns dominate conferences, publications, and conversations about higher education, but have much more to do with the procedures of education than its substance.

Under such conditions it is difficult to sustain quality; it is impossible to make a reasoned assignment of priorities for the use of limited resources; and the level of commitment that can be summoned for the essential tasks of higher education is diminished.

This essay is the first product of a long-term commitment of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to clarify the purposes of higher education, to explore what constitutes quality, to examine critically the specific functions that have come to be associated with institutions of higher education. Our key questions include: Education to what end? For what purpose? The long range goals of this effort will be:

- To evaluate the purposes of colleges and universities.
- To clarify the means by which these purposes are being achieved.
- To examine the attitudes and activities of those involved in the academic enterprise: especially the faculty, the students, and the leaders of education.
- To consider the alternatives to existing institutional purposes and established arrangements so that emerging needs can be met more efficiently.

The Foundation plans to keep the theme of quality and purpose permanently in place as the centerpiece of its efforts. We want to make these concerns topics for discussion on campuses across the country. We want to encourage current leaders of higher education—and potential leaders as well—to share our interest. We want to seek out ideas from many sectors and many people, and not rely wholly upon those whose wisdom and insights are already well-known.

Typically, a *Carnegie Essay* will be prepared on a topic significantly related to the purposes and quality of higher education. Upon its completion, the Foundation will commission a series of papers to explore the essay's central theme. A national *Carnegie Colloquium* will be held on the subject. It is hoped that at least one such colloquium, attended by academic leaders and distinguished representatives of such other spheres of endeavor as business, government, and the media, will be held annually.

This first essay in the Foundation's program on the purpose and quality of higher education is focused on general education, the learning that should be common to all people. We attempt to diagnose the problems that afflict it, to prescribe remedies, and to convey the promise a healthy general education curriculum offers.

Chapter one describes the weaknesses of current thinking, comparing the plight of general education to that of a spare room that has no agreed upon function. The second chapter reviews the historical evolution and social context of general education. There, the emphasis is on the three general education movements of the twentieth century. On the basis of that analysis, the third chapter provides a rationale for general education. Chapter four uses this definition to evaluate the pluses and minuses of current practice—the content, process, and outcomes of general education. The fifth chapter offers a proposal, including examples of a suggested general education program.

The opinions expressed in this volume are ours. To the extent that credit is deserved, it must be shared with many people who were kind enough to help us. The Carnegie Foundation's Board of Trustees read several drafts of the manuscript and commented on them extensively. The Foundation's Research Review Board, consisting of Howard Bowen, David Breneman, Burton Clark, K. Patricia Cross, Patricia A. Graham, Clark Kerr and Steven Wright gave the mauscript a thorough assessment. Additionally, a draft of the essay was discussed

by a seminar of young scholars. Its members were Eileen Bender, Cecilia Preciado Burciago, Steven M. Cahn, Stewart Edelstein, Kai Lee, John MacAloon, Joffre Whisenton, and Michael Winston. Others who read the manuscript at varying stages of its development include Bob Abernathy, Loren Baritz, Paul Boyer, E. Alden Dunham, Fred Hechinger, Martin Kaplan, and Frederick Rudolph. Richard Burnett was our ever ready, always thorough, research assistant. Verne Stadtman was a patient, thoughtful editor and willing colleague. Dick Martin suggested many helpful improvements. Secretaries Barclay Bennett, Nancy Carey, Debbie Dube, Rita Long, and Carol-Lynne Rokos typed draft after draft after draft of this essay with more grace and good humor than we had any right to expect. We are grateful to each of them.

ERNEST BOYER
ARTHUR LEVINE

Washington, D.C.

A QUEST FOR COMMON LEARNING

I

THE TALE OF THE SPARE ROOM

MANY HOMES have a spare room. It is not the domain of anyone in particular, as is a bedroom, and it does not have the household utility of a kitchen or bathroom. It is just the extra room.

Both of our homes have such a space. In one case, it is in the basement. It serves as a guest room. It is also used as a study and a library. There is a desk, a large number of books, and a filing cabinet. The basement is the place where older children play when they come to visit. It is also the place where odds and ends—chairs, tables, and pictures—are kept when no space can be found for them elsewhere in the house. In fact, the room bears a certain similarity to an unkempt, half-forgotten closet.

The irony is that, despite its many potential purposes, the basement room is not used very much. With all of the odds and ends scattered about, it is not a very comfortable study. There is no bed in it at the moment, so it does not offer good facilities for a guest. Because of its other uses, the basement cannot be wholly converted into a storage room. And the number of older children who come to visit is very few.

The fact is, the spare room's many functions render it rather useless for any *one* purpose. Every proposed use has a family champion. And there are cliffs when someone gains the upper hand. For example, when the mass of odds and ends overwhelms the study, an argument is likely to ensue. And although the clutter is lamented, the situation is unlikely to change—at least until a major spring cleaning occurs. Perhaps this is the plight of spare rooms—basements, attics, and even large closets—all across the country.

It is certainly the situation in at least one other house: the house of intellect. At colleges and universities, in fact, the typical undergraduate curriculum might be compared to a three-room house. From

campus to campus, the rooms tend to look very much alike. They are the three traditional parts of undergraduate study: the major, electives, and general education.

The first room, the academic major, has a clear purpose and an unchallenged tenant. It is that part of the curriculum where students examine a specialized field in depth and develop the methods of inquiry that a particular discipline requires. Even more obvious than its purposes is its proprietor. The major is, without a doubt, the province of the faculty and the academic disciplines.

Purpose and proprietorship are much the same for room two, electives. Who would disagree that electives are the unrequired portion of the curriculum, a place where personal preferences can be pursued? And who would deny that electives are the domain of students?

The third room, general education, is different from the other two. It does not belong to anyone in particular—not the faculty, not the students, not the administration. The purpose of this room appears vague. Though general education can be defined as the breadth component of a college education, any agreement beyond that quickly fades.

Those who have championed the cause of general education have contributed unwittingly to the confusion. Individually, they have been wise and illuminating. But taken together, their writings appear inconsistent and contradictory. While using the same term, *general education*, they were, we suspect, talking about very different things. A. S. Packard, the Bowdoin College professor who popularized the term, viewed it as a prerequisite for specialized study. Alexander Meiklejohn, father of the "survey course" and creator of the University of Wisconsin's acclaimed experimental college, considered general education to be precisely the opposite: an *antidote* to specialization! John Dewey thought of general education as "an integrative experience underlying the unity of knowledge." But A. Lawrence Lowell, the Harvard president who promoted distribution requirements, described it as the sum total of "a number of general courses in wholly unrelated areas." In 1947, the Presidential Commission on Higher Education defined general education as education for public participation. Yet John Stuart Mill, years before, claimed it to be education for a satisfying private life. The famed Harvard Report of 1945, *General Education in a Free Society*, called it plainly and simply "liberal education."

But Daniel Bell, in his book on general education, said just as positively that liberal education and general education are by no means synonymous.[1]

The diversity and contradictory nature of these views underscore the point we are making: general education is the spare room of academia with no one responsible for its oversight and everyone permitted to use it as he will. It is not surprising that different people, at different places and in different times, have proposed different general education purposes. Definitions are battlegrounds and the contradictions are often surrogates for more basic education arguments. Even so, in the absence of clear-cut goals, a hodge-podge of uses and misuses of general education have been spawned, and a plethora of incoherent programs have emerged. The one consistent and persistent use to which both general education and the spare room have been put is the least satisfying: they are simply storage spaces, places to keep odds and ends.

Like most spare rooms, general education is chronically in a state ranging from casual neglect to serious disrepair. Sporadic efforts at dusting, rearranging, and sprucing up absorb a great deal of effort and bring little in return. All in all, it is much easier to keep the door closed than to rethink the room's uses.

Traveling about the country, we asked colleagues about the purposes of general education, and we questioned reformers about their plans. We heard a flood of rationales for general education. Many appear promising, but none individually, nor all of them together, seem to go to the heart of the matter. In their variety, they represent, instead, a patchwork response to all the problems afflicting higher education today. General education, the spare room in the curriculum, is the easiest place to dump those concerns that everyone agrees are serious, but for which no one seems willing to take responsibility.

To be fair, many arguments for general education are appealing. Yet the long list of definitions and strategies we have heard confuses rather than clarifies the issue. They make general education appear to be a matter of personal predilection. Without some consensus about its purpose and meaning, the scores of different interpretations and definitions tend to cancel each other out.

We regret this situation. General education is of critical importance to both our colleges and our society, yet it will never again be a

strong and vital part of collegiate study until it has a recognized purpose of its own. The one positive sign we see is a growing willingness within the academic community to take a fresh look at general education. We think the new mood makes this an excellent time to clarify both the means and the ends of what, unhappily, has become the spare room of academic life.

II

A SUCCESSION OF REVIVALS

DURING THE PAST few years, we have seen a quiet but growing swell of concern for general education across the country. Most of the institutions we visited recently are revising their curriculum in one way or another. In aggregate, this appears to us to be nothing less than a national revival.

In 1978, an advertisement in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* asking for volunteer institutions to participate in a general education reform project drew more than 300 responses. That represents one out of every ten of the nation's colleges and universities.

The number of new general education books, ranging from handbooks and histories to philosophies and policy recommendations, is truly astounding. Between 1970 and 1979, the number of scholarly and professional articles on general education increased by 75 percent, while popular articles on the subject doubled. And there has been an outpouring of books describing general education planning at institutions running the gamut from Amherst College to the University of Vermont to Miami-Dade Community College.

General education conferences, meetings, and workshops—national and local, invitational and open—appear to be increasing at a still faster pace. Last year, there was even talk of a White House conference on the subject! Many of the national higher education associations now have general education projects of their own. In one typical association, approximately 80 percent of the membership wanted to participate.

Funding agencies have felt this surging interest. One private foundation reports that the volume of unsolicited general education proposals it receives has nearly doubled. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the nation's public foundation for higher education innovation, says that general and liberal education activities comprise more than 40 percent of its current projects.

Concern for general education is running deep off the campus, too. Consider the response to Harvard's recent general education reforms. The Harvard plan was news from coast to coast. *Newsweek*, *Time*, *Atlantic*, and network television all covered the initiative. A *New York Times* editorial expressed the hope that Harvard's way would become the nation's way.[1] In San Francisco, the Harvard report got front-page coverage.

Educational journals and newsletters were full of stories with titles such as "Where Does Harvard Lead Us," "Congratulations, But . . ." and "Revamping Core Curricula."[2] Within the higher education community, Harvard's proposed core curriculum even threatened for a time to eclipse talk of budgets and demographics. In fact, a number of schools, including the California State Universities and Colleges, announced plans to follow the Harvard lead and revise their curricula accordingly.

Not all the attention was favorable, to be sure. A *Washington Post* column lamented "The Trivialization of a Harvard Education." *Harper's* and the *Saturday Review* ran features entitled, respectively, "Harvard Flunks a Test" and "Confusion at Harvard." But our point remains: the news coverage was dramatic.[3]

Some might dismiss this fanfare as simply another example of the "Cambridge mystique." They would be wrong. This interest is more than a reflection of Harvard's influence, real as it is. In the late 1950s, the mid-1960s, and again in the early 1970s, Harvard proposed other curricular reforms. Yet press coverage in each case was scant. The difference between then and now, we believe, reflects the nation's changed mood. Today there is a growing feeling across the land that, once again, we need what general education has to offer.

Indeed, general education is touted on campuses from coast to coast as the answer to almost every educational and social problem we confront. Some educators, shaken by the Watergate trauma, see general education as a way of providing moral training to young people and resetting the ethical compass of the nation.[4] Values and ethics courses proliferate at institutions from Dartmouth College in New Hampshire to Los Medanos Community College in California. Courses such as "Professional Ethics for a Technological Era" at the University of Puget Sound are found in the curriculum at many colleges.

General education is viewed by some advocates as a way to

combat the neo-isolationism that swept the nation in the aftermath of the Vietnam War. In a world of shrinking resources, big-power conflict, nuclear proliferation, inexorable demographic pressures, and inequities in the distribution of life's necessities, it is painfully obvious that the fate of this rich and powerful nation is increasingly determined by events beyond our borders. Colleges and universities of every shape and size are confronting this reality by creating courses and programs to help students gain a global perspective.[5]

Even the familiar survey course in western civilization is viewed with renewed interest. Stanford and the University of Massachusetts, which abolished the western civilization requirement years ago, are reintroducing it. Others, including Columbia, which have continued to require such courses, are revitalizing them and sprucing them up.

Some observers see general education as an antidote to the "new narcissism," the self-absorption and myopic obsession with immediate gratification that seemed so pervasive in the culture of the seventies. Christopher Lasch, in his well-known jeremiad chronicling our contemporary condition, describes this phenomenon as "a retreat to purely personal preoccupations after the political turmoil of the sixties." "Americans," he writes, "seem to want to forget not only the sixties, the riots, the new left, the disruptions on college campuses, Vietnam, Watergate, and the Nixon presidency but the entire past. . . ."[6]

What we are witnessing today is the domestic equivalent of international isolationism, a weakening of the social fabric expressed in reduced voter participation; declining pride in citizenship; the growth of single-issue politics; and a loss of strong national leadership (or perhaps more accurately, a widespread unwillingness to follow leaders). Perhaps through general education, it is suggested, the "Me Generation" may be jolted from its preoccupation with the self.

Still other observers see general education as the answer to the decline in academic performance.[7] Since the mid-1960s, as is well-known, college admission test scores have dropped. Remedial instruction is offered on a host of campuses, and general education is being called upon to improve the performance of students, especially in language and mathematics. Surprisingly, this push to overcome academic deficiencies is occurring almost as frequently at highly selective colleges as at open-admission institutions.

General education is also being called upon to combat the "new

vocationalism." Today's students are far more job-oriented than their counterparts of the 1960s. The proportion selecting liberal arts majors has plummeted. In contrast, such fields as business and engineering are booming. The share of undergraduate enrollments in career-oriented subjects has increased by 50 percent since 1969. Nearly four of every ten undergraduates (38 percent) say they would leave college immediately if they could get the same job now as after graduation.[8] Responding to this challenge, institutions as varied as California's Scripps College, with its humanities internship program, and New Hampshire's St. Anselm's College, with its liberal arts nursing program, are trying to develop general education strategies directly linked to their students' career concerns.

Additionally, general education is viewed by some as a remedy for academic overspecialization. Today's undergraduates spend one-third more time studying in their majors than they did in the late 1960s. And two out of every five juniors and seniors say they would spend even *more* time in their major if other requirements were reduced! This swing away from general requirements to specialized study gained great momentum in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Many in higher education believe it is now time for the pendulum to swing back.[9]

Some college presidents and deans see general education as a solution to the problems of campus management. General education, they argue, may make the difference between survival and collapse. Instructional costs can be reduced, so the reasoning goes, by replacing proliferating departmental courses with a core curriculum taught by a smaller, leaner faculty. Even at schools where the budgetary crunch is less acute, tenured faculty, because of declining enrollments, will have smaller classes, and required general education courses are seen by some administrators as an easy remedy. Those who see faculty members as too specialized, and too remote from undergraduates, would improve the situation by reinvigorating general education.[10]

So the chronic struggle over the uses of the spare room goes on.

A MIRROR OF THE PAST

Although the general education revival we have just described is of

great significance, it is by no means unique. Since the turn of the century, the United States has experienced two other periods when enthusiasm for general education swept across the nation's campuses. As is the case today, each of these earlier periods was marked by a national debate; an outpouring of books and articles; a rash of curricular experiments; and a much publicized new proposal like the current one at Harvard, which came to epitomize the movement.

This is not to say that general education activity is limited to a series of Great Awakenings. As any faculty member or academic dean can affirm, general education tinkering goes on all the time. Both Daniel Bell's *The Reforming of General Education* and the "Great Books" curriculum at St. Johns in Maryland were produced when interest in general education was on the decline at many institutions. Our point is that while general education reform is an ongoing process, there are times when the pace accelerates, when the level of activity rises. In such times, general education reform on campus becomes not the exception, but the rule.

The first general education revival of this century occurred about the time of World War I. In 1914, President Alexander Meiklejohn of Amherst College introduced a survey course entitled "Social and Economic Institutions." It was a wide-angle view of society designed to introduce students to the "humanistic sciences." It was also an attempt to put the ideas of John Dewey into practice. As early as 1902, Dewey had said that the disarray and congestion of the typical college curriculum was not simply a consequence of poor teaching, as many claimed, but rather a result of the rapid expansion of knowledge. Dewey's remedy was an overview course he rather grandiosely described as "a survey, at least, of the universe in its manifold phases from which a student can get an 'orientation' to the larger world." [11]

The movement launched by Dewey and Meiklejohn gained momentum after the First World War, with the "survey course" as its centerpiece. In 1919, Columbia University introduced "Contemporary Civilization" and required all freshmen to enroll. This new course—a combination of a wartime army training class called "War Issues" and a post-war add-on called "Peace Issues"—was described in the 1919–20 Columbia catalogue in broad and ambitious terms:

The aim of the course is to inform the student of the more

outstanding and influential factors of his physical and social environment. The chief features of the intellectual, economic, and political life of today are treated and considered with their dependence on and their difference from the past. The great events of the last century in the history of the countries now more closely linked in international relations are reviewed, and the insistent problems, internal and international, which they now are facing are given detailed consideration. By thus giving the student, early in his college course, objective material on which to base his own judgment, it is thought he will be aided in an intelligent participation in the civilization of his own day.[12]

Dartmouth and Reed followed suit with their own survey courses. Soon such courses were turning up on campuses all over the country, with at least 30 schools simply copying the Columbia or Reed designs.

Toward the end of this general education revival, several well-known experimental colleges were born. In 1927, the Meiklejohn College was started at the University of Wisconsin. Here the survey course became a two-year program examining Greece in the Age of Pericles and the contemporary United States. In 1928, Missouri's Stephens College, a two-year institution for women, introduced a new curriculum based on "life needs" as distilled from activity diaries kept by 300 women college graduates in 37 states. And in 1932, the University of Minnesota created its own General College.

The most hotly debated experiment of the period was "the College" at the University of Chicago. The person whose name is inextricably linked with this venture is, of course, Robert Hutchins. In reality, the College was a series of experiments. It was launched before Hutchins arrived and continued not only after he retired, but even after the initial wave of general interest had long faded. The College at Chicago was a radical approach to general education, embodying, in varying degree, great books, interdisciplinary courses, early college admission, comprehensive examinations, and a four-year, fully-required course of study. The prestige of the University of Chicago and the charisma of Robert Hutchins caught the nation's imagination. Parts of the Chicago program were replicated in experimental colleges, honors

colleges, and schools across the country. St. Johns College is a direct descendant of the Chicago plan.

All of these experiments that followed the First World War were very much a reflection of the times. With the end of Roosevelt's "Square Deal" and Wilson's "New Freedom," the reform impulse in American politics diminished. By and large, the concern for municipal reform, corporate regulation, and social welfare legislation that had characterized the Progressive era languished. In the disillusioned aftermath of the First World War, many Americans turned away from vigorous, activist leadership of the Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson variety. With the election of Warren G. Harding and the Republican administrations that followed until 1933, the reform urge gave way to a conservative, business-like approach to government.

The middle class, once the backbone of Progressivism, turned to more hedonistic concerns. Muted now were the calls for social justice, the preachments about civic responsibility, and the commitment to the common good. Writing in 1933, the President's Research Committee on Social Trends discerned "a new attitude toward hardship as a thing to be avoided by living in the here and now."[13] As the social historian Frederick Lewis Allen put it, the nation in the 1920s was "spiritually tired":

> Wearied by the excitements of the war and the nervous tension of the big Red Scare (1919–1920), [Americans] hoped for quiet and healing. Sick of Wilson and his talk of America's duty to humanity, callous to political idealism, they hoped for a chance to pursue their private affairs without governmental interference and to forget about public affairs. There might be no such word in the dictionary as normalcy, but normalcy was what they wanted.[14]

In the midst of this drift toward personal and national isolation, general education was revived. As in our day, the movement was seen as the answer to almost every major academic and social problem. For some, general education provided a weapon against the misplaced emphasis of the typical college curriculum of the 1920s. Others believed that colleges and universities had gone too far in catering to individual interests. Then as now, overspecialization, excessive voca-

tionalism, and, above all, the free-elective system were criticized for ignoring the broad purposes of education. General education, it was argued, would help restore the balance.*

Others saw general education as a way to revive the misplaced reform agenda of Progressivism. In ways not made clear, general education courses were to help eliminate machine politics and municipal corruption, revive concern for social justice, and help integrate newly arrived immigrants into the mainstream of American life.*

General education was also seen as an answer to the intolerance and conformity of the 1920s. As Dewey and Meiklejohn were endlessly insisting, it would help young people understand and find a useful place in a complex industrial society on an interconnected globe.*

And at a less exalted level, general education was viewed by some colleges as a way to gain status by emulating prestige institutions such as Amherst, Columbia, and Chicago.*

But above all, for older Americans who were still rooted in the certitudes of the pre 1914 world, general education would combat the cynicism and disillusionment of the younger generation. Perhaps general education reform could revive the heady idealism and sense of national unity that had so suddenly and so mysteriously faded with the signing of the Armistice in November 1918.*

This long list of purposes suggests to us that the general education movements were deeply confused about their goals and values. Still more significantly perhaps, it indicates that reformers had very different notions about what the university should do and where society should go. Some of the arguments advanced were trivial while others were substantial. Key distinctions were not made between such radically different approaches as those at Stephens College and St. Johns College. Most important, general education advocates failed to recognize inherent contradictions in their thinking. Perhaps the central contradiction in the general education rhetoric of the 1920s was between the demand that higher education adapt to the complexities of the modern world, and the equally insistent call to recapture the idealism and cultural unity of the prewar era.

*See Appendix A for a full listing of rationales for general education in the post-World War I era.

Interestingly, while this first surge of general education interest was sparked by events beyond the campus, another noncampus crisis, the Great Depression, hastened its decline. During the early Depression years, college enrollment dropped. Student recruiting by business and industry plummeted. In 1935, an estimated one-third of the previous year's graduating class was unemployed, and another third held jobs for which they had "no interest, talent, or training." [15] Students wanted what everybody else wanted: jobs.

In response, there was a shift from general to vocational education. In 1933, 75 percent of undergraduates enrolled in the arts and sciences. In 1936, the figure had dropped to 69 percent. And by 1937, it was only 64 percent. The largest enrollment increases were in engineering and business administration and commerce. In the end, it was this Depression-fueled enrollment shift that halted the revival.

The second general education revival of this century followed a similar pattern. Again, the movement came on the heels of a world war. The New Deal and all it had come to stand for—political leadership, social legislation, a common national agenda—had been overshadowed by the war. Once again, Americans turned inward. And the mood of the country was familiar. Joseph C. Goulden in his popularized account of the postwar years, *The Best Years,* said that the United States in the 1950s:

> went into a holding period intellectually, morally, politically. Perhaps the pause was inevitable, even necessary; the nation was weary from depression, war, and reconversions, and the Eisenhower years proved singularly undemanding. The result, regardless, was a generation content to put its trust in government and in authority, to avoid deviant political ideas, to enjoy material comfort without undue worry about the invisible intrinsic costs. America misplaced, somewhere and somehow, the driving moral force it had carried out of the world war. . . . There were times, during the 1950s, when the entire nation seemed to be saying, 'Leave me alone.' [16]

The nation's preoccupations seemed more personal and less social. During this period, altruism declined. Charitable contributions fell off, yet expenditures on personal items such as jewelry and clothing increased.[17] With the sacrifices and shortages of the Depression and war

years still vividly in mind, a "catch-up" mentality spread across the land.

But on the nation's campuses, a more reflective, more sober attitude was stirring. World War II had been a profound intellectual and spiritual shock to many academics. Germany, that great center of scholarship, had spawned the barbarities of Nazism. Buchenwald and Auschwitz seemed to mock decades of lofty rhetoric about education's ennobling and civilizing power. Explosive revolutionary energy was stirring all over the world. A great power struggle with the Soviet Union loomed on the horizon. Most disturbing of all was the awesome power of the atomic bomb. Could this genie of science, once unleashed, be harnessed to humanistic purposes? It was against this somber background that American educators began to ponder once again the place of general education in academic life.

As a harbinger of this revival, a one-year western civilization course flourished at Stanford in 1939. Denison University in 1942 offered a core course entitled "Problems of Peace and Post-War Reconstruction." Later, Wesleyan, in Connecticut, introduced a freshman general education seminar. In the early 1940s the American Council on Education launched an ambitious fifteen-year general education research project that produced at least seven volumes. And the 1950s witnessed several experiments linking general education in high schools and colleges. Most notable was a project involving Andover, Exeter, Lawrenceville, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale.

But it was the 1945 Harvard report on *General Education in a Free Society* that became the national symbol of renewal.[18] This volume, informally called the "Redbook," was a 267-page report produced by a Harvard faculty committee after two years of study at a cost of $60,000. The committee not only called for a core curriculum at Harvard, but set a general education agenda for the nation's secondary schools, higher education establishment, and the larger community. Interest was immediate and widespread. Variations of the Harvard plan were adopted all across the country—though not in Cambridge itself, where, ironically, the Harvard faculty rejected the proposals. Two years later, a White House Commission on Higher Education for Democracy enthusiastically endorsed general education.

Like its predecessor, this new revival was also a product of the times. Once again, general education was called upon to combat evils

both on and off the campus. As in the 1920s, general education was asked to do battle with those academic bugaboos vocationalism, overspecialization, and the elective curriculum.*

Other familiar themes were dusted off. General education was needed to train citizens for public responsibility, remind them of their common heritage, promote "self-realization," and introduce nonscientists to the world of science. In addition, general education would help returning veterans, the updated immigrant newcomers, to integrate themselves into American life.*

Cutting through the familiar rhetoric, a new, more urgent note was sounded: the Western democracies were now engaged in intense conflict with "world communism" rooted in the Soviet Union. This struggle was ideological and spiritual no less than political and military. If the United States were to prevail, it was essential that the central values of American and Western civilization be reaffirmed. "Education for democracy" became the rallying cry. The authors of the Harvard "Redbook" defined their purpose as a "quest for a concept of general education that would have validity for the free society which we cherish." The Cold War did not alone cause the general education revival in the late 1940s and the 1950s, but it gave it a sense of urgency and historic purpose.*

As in the 1930s, it was a dramatic national crisis, this time *Sputnik*, that slowed this second general education revival. The 1957 Soviet space satellite was viewed as a Russian triumph over the technological and educational capacity of America. The response was a wave of academic specialization in the schools, with emphasis on science, foreign languages, and programs for the gifted.

After *Sputnik*, the average number of courses required to complete an academic major increased. In the natural sciences, for example, requirements typically rose by one full course. The number of honors programs, with an emphasis on early specialization, doubled. The number of students enrolled in advanced placement, allowing them to by-pass general education requirements, increased more than twofold. And senior theses more than tripled.[19] Ironically, the Cold War

*See Appendix A for a full listing of general education rationales during the post-World War II era.

competition, which had done so much to fuel this second wave of interest in general education, now helped to kill it.

General education was further battered by the social turbulence of the sixties. The required curriculum was attacked by campus radicals and educational reformers alike for its rigidity, its narrowness, and its failure to meet the needs of traditionally by-passed students. Minorities and, later, feminists viewed general education requirements with particular suspicion, arguing that they reflected only one narrow vision of the world. "Relevance" and "diversity" became the new shibboleths to be worshipped.

These accusations were not without validity. General education requirements often *did* present a parochial view of human experience. Lacking a clear and convincing purpose, the entire house of cards collapsed. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, general education requirements declined by approximately 25 percent. They were reduced in such core areas as English, foreign languages, and mathematics.[20]

But even as support for general education was eroding, the seeds of the contemporary revival were beginning to take root.

III

GENERAL EDUCATION: A ROOM WITH A PURPOSE

IN SURVEYING THE LITERATURE of the three general education reform movements of this century, we found literally dozens of goals reflecting different views of the world and different visions of what the nation's colleges and universities should be. (Our list of goals will be found in Appendix A.) Some of these objectives now seem institutionally self-serving and dated, if not embarrassingly jingoistic. One is tempted to conclude that general education is simply a mirror of what happens to be bothering a particular writer at a given time.

To a remarkable degree, these successive general education reforms did reflect the social concerns of their respective eras. Each movement occurred in a period of social drift and personal preoccupation. The movements were the products of times when war destroyed community, when political participation declined, when government efforts to set a common social agenda weakened, when international isolation was on the rise, and when individual altruism decreased. And a careful look suggests that, despite apparent conflicts and contradictions, general education activity from 1914 to the present reveals a significant, recurrent theme. Each general education revival moved in the direction of community and away from social fragmentation. The focus consistently has been on shared values, shared responsibilities, shared governance, a shared heritage, and a shared world vision. To us, this is an important point. It suggests that the ebb and flow of general education is, in fact, a mirror of broader shifts in the nation's mood.

During each revival, general education spokesmen consistently have been worried about a society that appeared to be losing cohesion, splintering into countless individual atoms, each flying off in its own direction, each pursuing its own selfish ends. They have been convinced that our common life must be reaffirmed, our common goals redefined, our common problems confronted. The specific agenda—

the preservation of democracy, the promoting of a common heritage, the development of citizen responsibility, a renewed commitment to ethical behavior, the enhancement of global perspectives, the integration of diverse groups into the larger society—has varied. But the underlying concern has remained remarkably constant. It reflects the never-ending tension between the individual and the group, between freedom and control, between independence and interdependence.

All societies, argued John Locke, are bound together by a tacit social contract, a compact among individuals who cede a portion of their autonomy for what is defined as the greater good. In exchange for this concession, every citizen expects certain services, specified protections, and agreed-upon rights and freedoms.

The contract is a pliant one. In most societies, it seems to move first in one direction, then another. When too great an emphasis is placed on group relationship, individuals feel herded, smothered, and restrained. They lament the lack of privacy and the intrusions of social obligations; they demand more opportunity to express their individuality and "be themselves." In contrast, when the pendulum swings strongly toward individualism and independence, people are apt to feel alone, isolated in an apathetic and uncaring world. In response, they move in the opposite direction, seeking to renew ties with their fellow human beings. Accepting this Lockean view, we suggest that it is precisely at these times, when social bonds are weakened, that general education movements take root.

The perennial tension between the individual and the community is mirrored in the college curriculum. The elective portion of the curriculum acknowledges individualism—the right of each person to act independently and make personal choices. So does an academic major; here the student, within limits, is permitted to decide what he or she wants to study.

General education is a different matter. This portion of the curriculum is rooted in the belief that individualism, while essential, is not sufficient. It says that the individual also shares significant relationships with a larger community. In this manner, general education affirms our connectedness. It is the educational tool we reach for in our search for renewal of the frayed social compact. Through general education on the one hand, and majors and electives on the other, the college curriculum recognizes both our independence *and* our interdependence.

It acknowledges the necessary balance between individual preferences and community needs. Just as we search politically and socially to maintain the necessary balance between the two, so in education we seek the same end.

This is not to say that general education should promote intellectual conformity or a sterile acquiescence to the notion of social cohesion. We are not talking about a spurious "togetherness" or an artificial consensus where none, in fact, exists. Quite the opposite. The kind of general education we envisage will focus on issues about which people feel most deeply, on points where conflict and controversy are most likely to occur. What will be shared is not a common set of conclusions, but a common agenda for study and investigation and a common discourse. The meaning of that agenda can be interpreted in many different ways—and surely it will be.

What, then, do we see as the agenda for general education? Simply stated, it is those experiences, relationships, and ethical concerns that are common to all of us simply by virtue of our membership in the human family at a particular moment in history. General education is an institutional affirmation of society's claim on its members.

We do not assert that this description of general education is particularly novel. It is as old as the Greeks, and throughout the years, it has had eloquent exponents. Woodrow Wilson, when he was president of Princeton, called for a general education that would focus on the common experiences, the common thoughts and struggles, the old triumphs and defeats. And Mark Van Doren of Columbia University once spoke of "the connectedness of things" as a major concern of educators.[1]

We do claim, however, that this kind of general education should be revitalized, not as a nostalgic return to a neglected tradition, but because it is urgently required. Today's students are the products of a society in which the call for individual gratification booms forth on every side while the social claim is weak and enfeebled. Current college freshmen were one year old when John Kennedy was killed. They were six when Johnson's Great Society ended, when Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King were assassinated, and when our cities were burned in riots. They were eleven when the United States disengaged from Vietnam. And they were twelve when the President of the United

States resigned from office in disgrace while other high administration officials were imprisoned as criminals. They have grown up in a fractured, atomized world in which problems multiply and solutions seem increasingly elusive. When undergraduates are asked which events most influenced their thinking, they answer most frequently "Watergate" and "Vietnam."[2]

Today's young people are understandably more cynical and less optimistic than their recent predecessors. They are educationally more competitive, geared toward training for jobs, and more committed to getting higher grades. While students are optimistic about their own futures, believing they will get good jobs, good money, and good things, they are pessimistic about the future of the nation and the world. Consequently, college students are more committed to their personal futures than to the future we face together.

Sadly, most colleges exacerbate this tendency toward [illegible] cupation and social isolation. The academic major and el[illegible], their emphasis on individual interests, are made the cente[illegible] of collegiate study while general education is in shambles. On campus after campus, there is no agreement about the meaning of a college education. We are more confident about the length of a baccalaureate degree program than we are about its substance.

In 1972, a Stanford University faculty committee proposed a new general education program, having dropped such a requirement a few years before. The student newspaper, in a biting attack on the faculty proposal, said in a front-page editorial that the new requirement would:

> remove from students the right to choose for themselves. . . . This is not to deny that courses in western culture are valuable and that most students could benefit from them. To require such a course, however, carries a strong, illiberal connotation. . . . It imposes a uniform standard on nonuniform people.[3]

We find this a startling statement. It is startling that the student editor failed to understand that while we are indeed "nonuniform," we are at the same time interdependent. We do have a shared cultural heritage, a shared agenda of urgent contemporary problems, and a shared future that cannot be ignored. *Uniformity* and *interrelatedness* are not synonymous.

As a global society, we simply cannot afford a generation that fails to see or care about such connections. Just a little over three years ago, President Sadat of Egypt said he would like to address the Israeli parliament. Hours later, satellites transmitted his remarks around the world. Days later, Barbara Walters, Walter Cronkite, and John Chancellor arrived in Cairo. Millions of people all around the world watched at home as an Egyptian plane touched down on Israeli soil.

It does not diminish what happened diplomatically in the Middle East to suggest that perhaps the most important consequence of this remarkable episode was the riveting of the whole world's attention on one single, breathtaking, symbolic image—a handshake by two former enemies. Instantly, 500 million people felt their "connectedness." Their perspective was expanded, and, for a moment, the world was moved by a bold gesture on behalf of peace.

Since that day, we have all shared the hope and disappointment of Camp David. We have watched a dynasty topple in Iran. And we saw the United States held hostage for over a year by one religious leader 10,000 miles away. Painfully, we have found that our gas pumps seem somehow connected to the Middle East. We have discovered, too, that American industry is almost wholly dependent on foreign sources for chromium, cobalt, bauxite, manganese, and tin. And now we vaguely sense that a child born today into a world of 5 billion people, if he or she attains age 60, will be sharing the earth with three times as many human beings. Global interdependence is, quite literally, hitting us from every side.

A college curriculum cannot ignore or diminish this aspect of our experience. To deny our relationship with one another and with our common home, Earth, is to deny the realities of existence. It is as irresponsible to imply to students that they have nothing in common as it would be to suggest that they are alike.

This recognition in no way diminishes our individual diversity. The uniqueness of each individual is a fact to be cherished, not deplored. To recognize that this nation is not one culture but many; to defend the rights of minorities; to preserve the right to dissent, even to disobey, are to acknowledge the essentials of a free society. To the extent that our colleges and universities have expanded their enrollments, broadened their curricula, and responded to the diversity of the students they enroll, they, and the nation, can be justly proud. Students

must be free to fulfill their own unique purposes and goals. That is why we have a wide range of electives, and why each student should be encouraged to pursue fully his or her own preferred academic concentration.

But this cannot be all. While affirming diversity, we also must acknowledge the claims of the larger society that give meaning to our lives. General education should be reaffirmed not as a sentimental tradition, but precisely because our future well-being, and perhaps even our survival, may depend on whether students understand the reality of interdependence.

We believe the mission of general education is to help students understand that they are not only autonomous individuals, but also members of a human community to which they are accountable. In education, as in life itself, one aspect of our being must not be allowed to eclipse the other. In calling for a reaffirmation of general education, our aim is to help restore the balance. General education, rather than continuing as the spare room in the house of intellect, must have a central purpose of its own.

At a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Lewis Thomas, acknowledging that these are not the best of times for the human mind, went on to observe:

> I cannot begin to guess at all the causes of our cultural sadness, not even the most important ones, but I can think of one thing that is wrong with us and eats away at us: we do not know enough about ourselves. We are ignorant about how we work, about where we fit in, and most of all about the enormous, imponderable system of life in which we are embedded as working parts.[4]

Dr. Thomas concluded by saying "if this century does not slip forever through our fingers it will be because learning will have directed us away from our splintered dumbness and will have helped us focus on our common goals." This, it seems to us, sums up both the purpose and the urgency of general education.

IV

A LOOK AT CURRENT PRACTICE

WE MAY AGREE on a clear, unifying purpose for general education, but this is only the beginning. The crucial next step is to translate that purpose into a well-shaped program. Just as the faculty of each department is obliged to determine what constitutes a major, so the institution as a whole must make sense of general education.

How well are we succeeding in translating purpose into practice? How effectively are the myriad general education programs fulfilling the fundamental aims of common learning? To answer these questions, we must look at current programs in terms of *content* (what students are required to study), *process* (how students are required to study), and *outcomes* (what students are expected to achieve).

THE CONTENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION

For the most part, the content of general education is housed within traditional academic disciplines, those bodies of knowledge—English, biology, art, history, and the like—around which colleges and universities organize their work. Traditionally, these subjects are clustered together in what we call departments. They are further grouped in divisions: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and the fine arts. About 95 percent of all colleges and universities base their general education programs, at least in part, on a study of selected courses within these academic departments and divisions.[1]

But the content of general education goes beyond the traditional disciplines to encompass interdisciplinary courses. These vary from simple blends of two disciplines, such as "The Artist as Philosopher" and "Biology and Religion," to vast collages like "Modes of Experience: Science, History, Philosophy, and the Arts." The aim is to bridge

the gap between the specialities, to interweave them. Nearly one-quarter of all colleges have interdisciplinary courses, but the total number is small when compared to general education offerings overall.[2]

Even less common are programs built on themes. But their diversity is enormous. They include programs that focus on work experience at Antioch College; on human problems in the context of such topics as "Conflict and Conflict Resolution" at John Jay College in New York City; on ways of knowing in a freshman seminar series on "Modes of Thought" at Brown University; and on use of the Great Books to explore the enduring ideas of the Western world at St. Johns College.

The point is clear. Colleges tend to organize the content of general education in two ways: narrowly, on the basis of traditional disciplines, or broadly, on the basis of interdisciplinary courses or themes, with a distinct accent on the former. After examining programs based on these two strategies, we conclude that they only infrequently achieve the real purpose of general education.

The argument in defense of a discipline-based general education program one hears most frequently is that "this is the way universities are organized." Higher education has historically divided knowledge into specialized departments and divisions, and to focus on these units of inquiry is to discover the full range of our accumulated wisdom.

We find this argument unpersuasive. It is true, of course, that the root word *universitas,* means "the whole." It is also true that, at its origin in the Middle Ages, the university was a guild or corporation of scholars associated in a *shared* intellectual enterprise. But as knowledge expanded, the structure of the academy grew more and more complex. The university began to organize itself on the basis of selected specialties that became the essence of the academic profession. Gradually, these artificial structural arrangements came to be considered essential for "disciplined" inquiry.

Today's imposing panoply of academic disciplines and departments is simply an historical artifact. It reflects the evolution (and fossilation) of a single human institution, the university. We should remind ourselves from time to time that these artificial structures do not exhaust the totality of human experience, or even the universe of knowledge. Indeed, our current way of dividing the curriculum into

departments and divisions has substantial drawbacks. Scholars are separated from one another, and students are encouraged to see the world of learning in a chopped-up, fragmented fashion, as through the segmented eye of a fly.

When we force general education into discrete departmental containers, its purposes are frequently subverted. The focus is too narrow. Connections are not made. When students are required to take a language course, a science course, and a history course, frequently they are simply introduced to these specialties from the point of view of a linguist, a scientist, and an historian. Each course has distinct boundaries; each inquiry is isolated from the other. Little thought is given to how the separate disciplines might actually contribute to a truly *general* education. If anything, the question is often posed the other way: how can general education contribute to the disciplines?

We are not suggesting that existing academic structures be abandoned. They are essential if scholarship is to be pursued. But we must also remember that the units of scholarly activity we call the disciplines have been organized for the purposes of specialization, not general education. They can be valuable allies of common learning, but they should not be viewed as its end.

The thematic approach, in theory at least, is significantly better. Here the emphasis is not on separate disciplines, but on ideas and issues that go beyond the traditional academic structure. The thematic and interdisciplinary approaches we have seen—on the nature of work, conflict and conflict resolution, and enduring ideas of the Western world—do reach across departmental lines and focus on essential human issues.

What troubles us is that the vast majority of thematic programs seem so casually conceived. The topics often appear almost randomly selected. They touch only a fraction of the significant relationships that are widely shared. No guiding principle determines which themes are selected for study and which are passed over. One year they move in one direction, the next in another. The result is a grab bag of unrelated topics, often novel, occasionally significant, but almost always disconnected.

Actually, an interdisciplinary program may provide a useful approach to general education. So might theme-oriented courses. Even the disciplines can contribute to general education if they look outward

and not inward. But all these approaches should be viewed as a means to a larger end. It is a serious mistake to equate one curricular strategy, such as an interdisciplinary curriculum or theme courses, with the *goal* of general education. The two are not the same.

THE PROCESS OF GENERAL EDUCATION

We require students to study the content of general education in a variety of ways. Sometimes the college dictates the courses to be studied. Sometimes the student is in charge. Frequently one finds a compromise between these two approaches.

The most common procedure is the familiar "*distribution requirement.*" Under this arrangement, students are required to take a minimum number of courses or credits in several broad fields of study. Ninety-five percent of the nation's colleges have such an arrangement.[3]

Distribution requirements come in a variety of shapes and sizes. In what are commonly called *prescribed distributions*, the college dictates most of the requirements, with few electives. For example, the Harvard Redbook proposed that all students take required courses in English composition, humanities, and social sciences; either of two courses in the natural sciences; plus three electives in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. More than seven out of ten distribution requirements now take this form—a blend of specified courses, guided options, and a few electives.[4]

Distribution arrangements known as *smorgasbord requirements* are less structured, giving more freedom to the student. At the University of Pennsylvania, for example, students can satisfy general education requirements by taking a foreign language and three courses in any two of the following areas outside of their majors: humanities, social science, natural science, or interdisciplinary studies. About one-quarter of all distribution requirements are of this type.[5]

Other distributions are only *recommended* by the college, not required. Students at Trinity College in Connecticut are urged to take courses in four theme areas—language and other symbolic systems, human interaction with the natural world, human social institutions, and forms of culture. Whether such courses are actually taken is entirely at the discretion of the student.

Another pattern is the *self-paced distribution* program. At Hampshire College in Massachusetts, general education is linked to examinations and projects rather than to specific courses. Hampshire has requirements in the natural sciences and mathematics, language and communications, social sciences, and humanities and art, but students are largely responsible for determining how and when these requirements will be met.

Still more open-ended is the *contract approach* to common learning. This is an arrangement worked out by a student and advisor to meet distribution requirements. At Metropolitan State University in Minnesota, for example, each student has a personally-tailored program to provide exposure in five broad areas: basic skills, personal growth and development, civic skills, vocational skills, and cultural and recreational skills.

These varied distribution requirements are tied by a common thread. All assume that students do need some common educational experiences. How those experiences are achieved can take many forms, controlled in varying degrees by both the college and the student.

Around the country today, one finds two sharply contrasting alternatives to the distribution approach. The first is the wholly required course of study with no electives, often called the *core curriculum*. The earliest core program in America dates from 1642. This, the first college curriculum, was a rigid three-year program including just twelve subjects. All students advanced in lock-step fashion, studying together one subject a day from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and a half-day Saturday. In the first year, they took logic, Greek and Hebrew, rhetoric, divinity catechetical, history, and the nature of plants. The second year included ethics and politics, Aramaic, and further studies in rhetoric and divinity catechetical. The final year was capped by arithmetic, astronomy, Syriac, more Greek, and—what year would be complete without it?—rhetoric and divinity catechetical.

A more contemporary example of the core approach is a new 45-credit program introduced by St. Joseph's College in Indiana. All students are required to take eight "theme" courses: "The Contemporary Situation" and "The Hebrew and Graeco-Roman Heritage" in the freshman year; "The Middle Ages" and "The Modern World" in the sophomore year; and "Man in the Universe" and "Nonwestern

Studies" in the junior year. The final year at St. Joseph's is capped by "Toward a Christian Humanism" and "Christianity and the Human Situation."

These two core curricula, one from the 17th century and one from the 20th, differ enormously in detail, but the underlying assumption is the same. The framers of both agree that each student should study the same subjects, and that they should be studied in the same fashion. Today, about 2 of every 100 colleges in the United States has such a program.[6]

The second, and even rarer, alternative to the distribution approach is just the opposite. It is wholly elective. There are *no requirements*. All is left to the student. At first blush, this looks like a contradiction, but every institution with such a program we know of expresses a strong commitment to general education. For example, one college claims that since all its courses are of equal merit, no one course in particular needs to be required! Another college supports general education, but says the student, not the institution, should determine its content. Today only about 3 of every 100 colleges have such a program.[7]

These three approaches—core, distribution, and electives constitute a continuum. At one end, the core curriculum holds that all students need to know the same things and should learn them in the same fashion. At the other, the wholly elective curriculum is based on the notion that all people need to know different things and should learn things in a variety of ways. In the vast terrain between these two extremes is the distribution approach, rooted in the belief that all students need to know "generally" the same things, but that they can learn them in a variety of ways.

How do these different approaches achieve the purposes of general education? Let us begin with the core curriculum. This approach is a product of a time when colleges did not acknowledge individual differences. Education was guided by a vision of coherence, based on a shared social structure, a common view of how all young minds should be trained, and a more or less common set of theological and ethical assumptions. Within this framework, bitter disputes sometimes raged, but from today's perspective there was a frozen and monolithic character to it all.

Out of this environment, a concern for the individual evolved

in the only fashion it could: slowly, in fits and starts, with a few new technical and scientific subjects here, a modern language elective there. Curricular diversity mirrored the growing social and cultural diversity among students. But these reforms were predictably resisted. As late as 1828, the Yale faculty was still fighting doggedly against the proposition that each student "be allowed to select those branches of study which are most to his taste, which are best adapted to his peculiar talents, and which are most nearly connected with his intended profession."[8] For them, this belief was still heresy.

Yet heresies have a way of becoming orthodoxies. Declining enrollments and changing student interests sped the process. Industrialization, immigration, urban growth, and a Civil War changed the character of society. Research and the explosion of new knowledge broke up the traditional categories of academic study. The curriculum was moving toward the preparation of specialists. And students were beginning to organize their own courses of study.

In 1869, Harvard University inaugurated both a new president and the era of free electives. In 1872, it abolished senior year requirements. Seven years later, juniors were liberated. In eight more years, sophomores were freed. Finally, in 1897, Harvard requirements were reduced to a single year of freshman rhetoric.

By the 1890s, to fight the elective curriculum was to buck the tide. Consider the College of Charleston. That tiny institution of only thirty students clung to its classical core curriculum until 1897, when an elective system was introduced. Within two years, a new dormitory was needed to house the overflow of applicants![9] Individualism had become king in undergraduate education. Commonality gave way to diversity. President Eliot of Harvard called it "variation," but the principle was the same.[10]

A curriculum based on diversity represented a sharp departure from the colonial college. Instead of reflecting the outlook and needs of a cohesive community, education was geared increasingly to the interests of the individual student. Instead of offering a common education for all, colleges began to offer an individualized education to each student.

Enthusiasm for a curriculum shaped entirely by the student reached a peak of popularity in the early 20th century, and then gradually declined. Distribution requirements championed by A.

25

Lawrence Lowell after he became president of Harvard in 1909 emerged as the compromise between the rigidity of the core and the randomness of electives. And this is about where we stand today.

Given what we have concluded about the purpose of general education, a program based wholly on electives seems clearly unacceptable. Emphasizing only the differences in student background, interests, and goals runs counter to the idea of a shared education. Concluding that there are no common experiences or shared concerns to be explored risks turning campuses into academic supermarkets, places where students come in, shop around for eight semesters, and then check out with no questions asked. We would like to believe that an unguided, random course selection by students might achieve the general education goals we have in mind, but a survey of the literature suggests the opposite.

We also conclude that the smorgasbord distribution approach, while appealing, rarely serves the purposes of general education effectively. Even when a few specific courses are required, the selection usually lacks rationale or coherence. The interpretation of "commonality" is largely quantitative. What students "share" is six credits of science or a couple of courses in the social sciences, three credits of economics, or three credits of psychology. A distribution requirement in English can be satisfied equally well by a course on literature from creation to the Renaissance; a course on Faulkner; or even courses in journalism, film, or creative writing. This is not general education!

We do not reject the principle of diversity in education. In fact, we applaud it. The fixed curriculum of the colonial college is as much an anachronism as the stocks in the village square. Our world would be unrecognizable to the men who founded Harvard College in 1636. The era of the tightly knit sectarian community has given way to the age of the complex industrial society. Today's students are incredibly more heterogenous than their colonial college ancestors. They represent a wider range of ability levels, learning styles, backgrounds, and goals. We must offer them a diverse curriculum. In the academic major and electives, individual differences must be served.

But diversity does not suggest an appropriate philosophy for general education. Provision must also be made for commonality. Only core programs and prescribed distributions seem to have a real poten-

tial for responding to the purposes of general education we have in mind. Few of these programs are now successful. Many core curricula are too narrowly focused and fail to explore the broader human relationships. Most prescribed distributions define the purposes so broadly, and permit so many different and unrelated courses to satisfy requirements, that, again, no sense of commonality emerges. Goals are not clear. Whatever the means of general education may be, at the heart of the enterprise must be the recognition that beyond our individual differences lie fundamental human relationships, common experiences, and collective concerns that can and must be thoughtfully explored by all students.

THE OUTCOMES OF GENERAL EDUCATION

The final element in our examination of current practices relates to outcomes. Rather than trying to tell people what they should study (a little history, some literature and psychology, seasoned with a dash of science), or how they should study it, some colleges and universities focus on the *outcomes* of education, the information, attitudes, and values all students are expected to acquire as a consequence of having attended a particular institution.

This approach dates back to our first colleges, when educators talked more than they do today about the qualities of the educated person, and when the content and processes of education were a reflection of that vision. At Harvard in 1642, this meant educating an individual able "to read the originalls of the Old and New Testament into the Latine tongue, and to resolve them logically; withall being of godly life and conversation."[11] Today, college catalogs refer to other outcomes: an understanding of natural phenomena; knowing one's culture; appreciating the aesthetic aspects of life; having the ability to solve problems; or having a facility in language. The list goes on. Over time, the rhetoric has changed, but the notion of a cultural ideal persists. The approach is a popular one, and most colleges still make a stab at defining the ideals of education.

A recent variation on this approach is called *competency-based* general education. Priority is given to specific outcomes rather than to content or method. At Alverno College in Wisconsin, all students

must demonstrate their "competence" in such areas as communications, analytic capability, problem-solving, valuing and decision-making, social interaction, the individual and the environment, the contemporary world, and the arts. These requirements are met in a variety of traditional and nontraditional ways, including courses, tests, independent study, fieldwork, and prior experience. Less than 1 percent of the nation's colleges follows this approach.[12]

After having looked at several outcome-based programs, we conclude that this can be a useful approach to general education. The emphasis on goals or achievement provides an excellent way to translate the philosophy of general education into practice. But we also have observed several problems.

When colleges talk about the outcomes of a college education the terms "general" and "liberal" education often are confused. These are not synonymous. General education refers to just one part of the undergraduate program. Liberal education includes the total experience. Ideally, when all the pieces—general education, the major, electives, and nonclassroom activity—are effectively combined, liberal education occurs. The student becomes, we say, a liberally-educated person. A distinction, then, must be drawn between the specific objectives of general education and the whole of the undergraduate experience. When colleges fail to distinguish the two clearly, general education tends to get lost, or to carry more baggage than it should.

A second difficulty is the disparity between outcomes and the programs designed to achieve them. Institutions may talk grandly about pedestrian courses of study. At one college, for example, "understanding of natural phenomena" translates into a biology course; "knowledge of human cultures" becomes a course in Western civilization; "appreciation of aesthetics" is any three-credit fine arts course; "problem-solving" is just an introduction to mathematics; "scientific method" really means logic; and "language" is English composition plus a dollop of French or Spanish. When this occurs, the means define the ends. Lofty rhetoric notwithstanding, the focus is once again on traditional academic subjects.

CURRENT GENERAL EDUCATION PRACTICE AT A GLANCE

Content	*Process*	*Outcome*
The academic disciplines	"Core" programs	The educated person outcomes
Interdisciplinary and themes	Distribution requirements	Competency-based outcomes
	Elective programs	

CONCLUSION

In both purpose and practice, general education is now confused. In terms of content, there is a tendency to restrict general education to a study of specialized courses or to randomly selected themes. As to process, there is a tendency to define the options for study so broadly that no meaning can be found. With regard to outcome, there is a tendency to confuse general and liberal education and convert broadly stated goals into narrow requirements. Means and ends become confused.

A great deal has been said about the difference between potential and performance. The distinction is important. We are confident that, with more thoughtful planning, much of what is being done on many campuses can form the basis of a coherent and effective program. But the various components—content, process, outcomes—must be more effectively combined. They must form a more coherent whole. Minute attention to any one component in isolation cannot compensate for the lack of a unifying vision of what a general education curriculum should be.

In 1977, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching described general education as a "disaster area."[13] We believe that conclusion remains valid today. Our examination of current practice certainly confirms it.

But our survey has also convinced us that general education need

not remain a disaster area. The tools are available to make general education work. The missing ingredient has been a sharply defined and clearly stated purpose. In the final section of this essay, we shall suggest one way to translate that purpose into practice.

V

A PROPOSAL

IN HIS BOOK *The Mountain People,* anthropologist Colin Turnbull describes a once-thriving North African tribal community in which, through adversity, relationships have broken down. Common values have deteriorated; traditions have lost their evocative power. The social cement holding the tribe together—its heritage, values, and mutual relationships—has crumbled. The result, says Turnbull, is the breakdown of community.

On a different scale, we see the potential for something like this overtaking our society. And here, we believe, is where general education has an urgent role to play. General education should concern itself with those shared experiences without which human relationships are diminished, common bonds are weakened, and the quality of life is reduced. It should focus on our areas of interdependence, as members of the human family and of a specific society. In short, it should concentrate on those experiences that knit isolated individuals into a community.

What are these experiences? Obviously, many different lists could be drawn up. For purpose of discussion, we have identified six broad subject areas that we believe to be the proper concern of general education. Through general education, we would suggest, all students should come to understand that they share with others the use of symbols, membership in groups and institutions, the activities of production and consumption, a relationship with nature, a sense of time, and commonly held values and beliefs. It seems quite clear to us that an exploration of these connections is indispensable if students are adequately to understand themselves, their society, and the world in which they live.

44

SHARED USE OF SYMBOLS

Human beings' use of symbols separates them from all other forms of life. Language gives individuals their identities, makes transactions among people possible, and provides the connecting tissue that binds society together. In 1941, Albert Einstein observed that, in the most advanced stages of its development, language "becomes an instrument of reasoning in the true sense of the word."[1] Norbert Weiner, the father of cybernetics, went further. Society, he said, "can only be understood through a study of messages."[2] Learning about the significance of our shared use of symbols is, we believe, a central goal of common learning.

Many general education programs already demonstrate the centrality of language. Eight of every ten colleges have English composition requirements for graduation; three of every ten have mathematics requirements; two of every ten have a foreign language requirement; and two out of every ten have a fine arts requirement.[3] But frequently these courses are too narrowly focused; relationships among various symbol systems are not carefully examined; and, all too often, students study language without understanding the broader social significance of the process. Clearly, something more is needed.

We propose that all students, from the very first years of formal schooling, learn not only to "read and write," but also to read with understanding, write with clarity, and listen and speak effectively. In addition, they should become proficient in the use of numbers, which constitute an essential and universally accepted symbol system, too. The mastery of these skills is the foundation of common learning. Without them, the goals of general education will be undermined.

But the development of language skills, as important as this may be, is not enough. Students should also come to understand why and how language has evolved, how messages reveal the values of a culture, how words and thoughts interact, and how feelings and ideas are conveyed through literature. The study of a *second* language is particularly important here, not just because of its direct utility, but also because such a study helps students view language freshly and see how language reflects cultural values and traditions.

Students should explore, as well, how we communicate nonverbally, through music, dance, and the visual arts. They should under-

stand how these forms of expression permit us to convey subtle meanings, express intense emotions and how, uniquely, nonverbal symbols can stir a deep response in others. Murray Sidlin, the conductor of the New Haven Symphony has said:

> When words are no longer adequate, people turn to art. Some go to the canvas and paint; some stand up and dance. But we all go beyond our normal means of communicating and this is the common human experience for all people on this planet.[4]

The impact of mass communication should also be examined. In the United States, children watch television 6,000 hours before they spend a single hour in the classroom. By the time they graduate from high school, they will have spent 16,000 hours in front of television sets and only 11,000 hours in the classroom. Students urgently need what might be called "tube literacy," to help them see how visual and auditory signals reinforce each other, how ideas can be distorted, how thoughts and feelings can be subliminally conveyed, and how the accuracy and reliability of messages can be tested.

The language of computers merits study, too. Nearly 30 percent of all college juniors and seniors now take computer courses.[5] But most of this instruction deals only with hardware and programming. In *The Micro Millenium*, Christopher Evans suggests that the book is on a "slow but steady slide into oblivion." "Computers will take over," he writes, "because they store more information and because their information can be more rapidly retrieved."[6] Like the report of Mark Twain's death, predictions of the immediate demise of the book may be greatly exaggerated, but the importance of the computer in our lives—not only in the future but right now—can hardly be overstated. Every generally-educated student should learn about this pervasive signal system that increasingly controls our day-to-day transactions.

The goals we have just proposed are ambitious; but they are essential if students are to live knowledgeably in a world where thousands of messages every day—some routine, some distracting, some momentous—shape their lives. Language is, and always has been, the glue of our social existence, holding us together, housing us in meaning. We believe this reality should be confronted by all students.

SHARED MEMBERSHIP IN GROUPS AND INSTITUTIONS

"We do not make a world of our own," Ralph Waldo Emerson observed nearly 150 years ago, "but fall into institutions already made, and have to accommodate ourselves to them. . . ."[7] Institutions are a fact of life. They touch almost every aspect of our being—economic, educational, familial, political, and religious. We are born into institutions; we pass much of our lives in institutions; and institutions are involved when we die.

Today, public trust in institutions is low, and alienation from them is high. Yet they cannot and will not be abandoned. Government, business, the church, the family, all provide arrangements through which daily transactions are conducted, interpersonal relationships are nurtured, and social structure is maintained. Robert Park, the University of Chicago sociologist, made this point clearly years ago. "A community is not a collection of people, but institutions," he said. "Institutions are final and decisive in distinguishing the community from other social constellations."[8] All students, as a central goal of general education, should learn about their shared membership in groups and institutions.

Less than 10 percent of American colleges and universities now require students to take a course that focuses directly on social institutions.[9] When such courses are required, they frequently are preprofessional, intended primarily for the specialist. The general education curriculum we have in mind would look at the origin of institutions: how they evolve, grow strong, become oppressive or weak, and sometimes die. It would examine, as well, how institutions work, explore the interaction between institutions and individuals, and show how such interaction both facilitates and complicates our existence.

In addition to this broad-gauge approach, we suggest an inductive study, one that looks more penetratingly at a *single* institution—the Peace Corps, the AFL-CIO, the National Rifle Association, the city council; or one related, perhaps, to a student's special field of interest. How did the institution begin? What were its initial purposes? What new missions has it assumed? To whom is it accountable? Is the institution still vital, or is it being maintained only because of ceremony and tradition?

To look at the way institutions have been built and how they are reshaped does not mean the resurrection of traditional civics courses. Rather, the goal should be to help students see that everyone shares membership in the "common institutions" of our culture: those social structures that shape our lives, impose obligations, restrict choices, and provide services that we could not obtain in isolation.

SHARED PRODUCING AND CONSUMING

The urge to be active and useful is found in every age and culture. Throughout life, almost everyone is kept busy producing and consuming. We need the contributions of our fellow human beings and they need, from us, something in return. George Bernard Shaw caught the point when he said: "We have no more right to consume happiness without producing it than to consume wealth without producing it."[10] Students should understand that everyone produces and consumes and that, through this process, we are dependent on each other. This is an essential part of common learning.

Today, the study of producing and consuming is largely ignored in the curriculum, except perhaps in departments of business and economics.[11] Work choices are exceedingly important in our lives and yet colleges fail to help students explore, with care, the meaning of vocation.

We propose a general education program that explores the significance of work in the lives of individuals and examines how work patterns reflect the values and shape the social climate of a culture. Such a curriculum would ask: What have been the historical, philosophical, religious, and social attitudes toward work around the world? How are notions about work related to social status and human dignity? What determines the different status and rewards we grant to different forms of work? Why is some work highly rewarded and other work relatively unrewarded? In addition, general education should help students discover that work, at its best, can be life-fulfilling, that it is, as Eugene Delacroix writes, that, through work, "We seek not only to produce but to give value to time."

If work epitomizes our interdependence, so does leisure. General education might well examine the place of leisure in our lives: how

leisure has been viewed throughout history; how attitudes toward leisure shift from culture to culture and from one social level to another; how leisure can be much more than the absence of work; and how one's leisure-time choices can affect others. All of these are appropriate for study.

We do not suggest that the nation's colleges and universities should become vocational or recreational institutions. But production, consumption, work, and leisure are central to our common experience. They are the ways we define ourselves. Their study, we believe, can be a legitimate, demanding part of general education.

SHARED RELATIONSHIP WITH NATURE

All life forms on the planet earth are inextricably interlocked, and no education is complete without an understanding of the ordered, interdependent nature of the universe. As Lewis Thomas, in his Phi Beta Kappa Oration at Harvard University, reminded us:

> There are no solitary, free-living creatures: Every form of life is dependent on other forms. The great successes in evolution, the mutants who have, so to speak, made it, have done so by fitting in with, and sustaining, the rest of life. Up to now we might be counted among the brilliant successes, but flashy and perhaps unstable. We should go warily into the future, looking for ways to be more useful, listening more carefully for the signals, watching our step, and having an eye out for partners.[12]

General education means learning about the elegant, underlying patterns of the natural world and discovering that all elements of nature, in some manner, are related to each other.

Eight of every ten colleges now have a general education "science" requirement of one kind or another, but few students seem to move very far in developing the perspective of which Dr. Thomas speaks.[13] The current practice of permitting students to meet their general education requirements by electing a beginning course in physics, biology, chemistry, or a diluted version for non-science majors,

seldom serves the purposes of general education. It does not make sense even from a preprofessional perspective.

K. Danner Clouser, "Philosopher-in-Residence" at Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine, says that most students, even after an introductory course in biology or chemistry "have little grasp of how it [science] works, of what its genius consists, what its theories are, how they are tested and what defeats them. . . . Science is, for them, a catalog of facts . . . complete and beyond question." [14] Such courses have long been criticized. In fact, the 1945 Harvard Redbook chastised them for promoting "narrowness which is an inevitable aspect of academic departmentalization." [15]

The lines dividing the traditional natural science disciplines are becoming blurred. Breakthroughs are occurring precisely at the points where, traditionally, the disciplines have been separated. We believe a new approach is needed, one that introduces students, not just to the "facts" of science—the basic concepts, theories, and relationships—but to its methodology, too. We propose that all students come to understand how science is a process of trial and error; how, through observation and testing, theories are found, refined, sometimes discarded and often give rise to other theories. Students should learn about the applications of science and see how scientific discoveries have led to a flood of inventions and new technologies that have brought them both benefits and risks.

Finally, there is the matter of science and citizenship. The British novelist and scientist C. P. Snow said that between science and society there lies "a gulf of mutual incomprehension." [16] Unfortunately, this gulf is widening at the very time policy issues of great significance must be urgently examined. If students are intelligently to evaluate the pros and cons of nuclear power, space exploration, food additives, and pollution standards, they must become more knowledgeable about underlying facts and principles behind the headlines.

Becoming a responsible human being in the last quarter of the 20th Century means learning about the great power of science, its pervasive influence in all aspects of our life, and our own shared relationship with nature. This is an essential part of common learning.

Our common heritage is a bridge that holds us all together in ways we hardly understand. It is more than this. It is what Edmund Burke termed "a pact between the dead, the living, and the yet unborn." It is essential that the human race remember where it has been and how, for better or worse, it goes where it is. An understanding of our shared heritage should be expected of all students.

Nine out of ten colleges and universities now have a Western civilization or some other social science requirement as a part of the general education program.[17] Some of these courses are carefully planned and imaginatively taught, providing the kind of historical perspective all students need. But many others fall far short of this objective. They offer students a breathless dash through history, an eclectic muddle, or a study of one isolated period devoid of its connections to the present.

We propose a study of our common heritage that would focus on the seminal ideas and events that have decisively shaped the course of history. More than a collection of facts, this approach would emphasize the convergence of social, religious, political, economic, and intellectual forces. In such a study, no attempt should be made to worship coverage. Choices must be made. To select a few themes carefully, and explore them intensively across disciplinary lines is entirely appropriate, we believe, to the goals of common learning.

Students should learn, as well, that the chronicle of humanity is by no means a swift and straight march in the direction of progress. It is an endlessly varied struggle to resolve tensions over freedom and authority, conformity and rebellion, war and peace, rights and responsibilities, equality and exploitation. At bottom, an inquiry into the roots of our civilization should be seen as a study of continuity and change, with leaps forward and spills backward.

One further point. It is not enough to be told that events have taken place; ideas have been expressed; and societies have risen, flourished, and declined. The approach we envision would emphasize the *interrelationship* between ideas and culture. It would explore, not just governments and leaders, but "ordinary" people; not just politics and diplomacy, but literature, and religion and the family.

Will and Ariel Durant said that:

> Civilization is a stream with banks. The stream sometimes filled with blood from people killing, stealing, shouting and doing things historians usually record, while on the banks, unnoticed, people build homes, make love, raise children, sing songs, write poetry and even whittle statues. The story of civilization is the story of what happened on the banks.

The fundamental questions must be: What has the past to do with us? How does it shape our world today? In looking to the past, we gain a new perspective on the present.

All human beings look in *two* directions. We recall the past and anticipate the future. Both perspectives determine, at least in part, how we behave today. "What do we predict for the 1980s?" or "What will life be like in the year 2000?" could only be asked by those with a sense of a shared tomorrow. Indeed the labels "past" and "future" are, in a fundamental sense, distinctions without meaning. T. S. Eliot wrote: "Time present and time past are both present in time future, and time future contained in time past. . . ."[18]

Most scholars are understandably reluctant to speculate about a world that is yet to be. They are unwilling to be identified, even obliquely, with professional "futurologists" who predict progress or disaster with equal certainty. Despite this reluctance, general education should, we believe, help all students understand how past visions of the future have shaped the course of history. They should be asked to think about the "options for the future" we confront today. Above all, students should begin to understand that much of what we call "the future" has, in fact, been predetermined by political, economic, social, and scientific decisions of the past.

The kind of air we breathe, the way we travel, the nature of the social order, patterns of global relationships, the jobs we can and cannot choose—these matters, and most others—are not totally open to chance. Decisions of the past have shaped *our* world, and tomorrow's world is being shaped today. Exploring our shared sense of time is a central part of common learning.

SHARED VALUES AND BELIEFS

Inherent in our relationships with others are patterns of agreed-upon

behaviors: laws, customs, and traditions that reflect widely shared beliefs. In traveling around the world, one is struck more by the similarities than by the differences of people, more by the predictability than by the unpredictability of human behavior. All individuals and societies are continuously making choices, revising their standards of conduct, debating "right" and "wrong," deciding what currently is good and what is best. A study of the personal and social significance of shared values should be the capstone to common learning.

The Hastings Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences reports that since the early 1970s, when the nation's conscience was aroused by the Watergate affair, courses on values have increased rapidly in professional schools. At least 50 percent of all medical schools now offer such courses, and law, business, and engineering schools are following suit. Today there are more than 1,000 undergraduate courses in bioethics alone.[19]

While these efforts are commendable, they are too few and too specialized. We suggest that, through general education, all students examine the distinctions we make between beliefs and "facts," and how values are formed, transmitted, and revised. They should examine, too, the values currently held in our society, looking at the ways such values are socially enforced, and how societies react to unpopular beliefs. General education should introduce all students to the powerful role political ideologies, and particularly religion have played in shaping, throughout history, the convictions of individuals and societies.

Students should be reminded, too, that the university itself—through its curriculum, student selection, grading system, research design, arrangements for promotion and tenure, and all the rest—reflects the choices of its members. None of these choices is "natural." All are human-made, born of values, rooted in tradition.

Finally, each student should be able to identify the premises inherent in his or her own beliefs, learn how to make responsible decisions, and engage in a frank and searching discussion of some of the ethical and moral choices that confront us all. Such a study relates directly to the general education themes we have just discussed. In every one of these shared experiences, moral and ethical choices must be made. How, for example, can messages be honestly and effectively conveyed? How can institutions serve the needs of both the individual *and* the group? On what basis is a vocation selected or rejected? Where

can the line be drawn between conservation and exploitation of natural resources? These are only a few of the consequential ethical and moral issues that a common learning curriculum must confront.

In the last analysis we are persuaded by Bertrand Russell: "Without civic morality communities perish, without personal morality their survival has no value."[20] We do not suggest, of course, that college and universities should seek to impose a single set of values. Rather, the aim of general education should be to help students think clearly about how values are shaped, and how each one of us must build, and periodically review, an authentic, satisfying value structure of our own.

ALTERNATIVES FOR ACTION

The six general education themes we have proposed have been described in broad, even sweeping terms. The program suggestions we have made should be viewed as illustrations rather than a blueprint. We wish to underscore the point that they can be carried out in a variety of ways. In the end, each college and university faculty must clarify for itself the purposes of general education and shape a program to reflect its own unique values and traditions. Our purpose has been to initiate general education planning, not complete it.

Also, the general education goals we have discussed cannot be achieved fully in any two-year academic sequence, or even a lifetime. At the same time, we believe that with careful planning, a good beginning can be made. For one thing, the first-year college student has already completed twelve years of formal education. The nation's colleges and universities should build on this foundation.

The problem is that in recent years, as general education requirements were abandoned by higher education, such requirements were abandoned in the schools. Educators at all levels became increasingly unclear about what it means to be an educated person. The time has come, we feel, for school and college leaders to work together to clarify the goals of common learning. As this partnership is forged, we are confident that the goals we have discussed can be more effectively achieved.

We wish to emphasize another point. Some of the general education goals we have discussed may call for special interdisciplinary

or thematic courses. In other instances existing departmental courses in English, history, sociology, or science may effectively fill the bill. But here we add a word of caution. It would be a great mistake to slip existing courses into a general education curriculum unexamined. The title of a course may sound appropriate to general education, and the catalogue description may be appealing. But the way the course is actually taught may, in fact, promote specialized, not general education. The central question is not whether the curriculum selected is old or new, disciplinary or thematic—but whether students are helped to understand the shared relationships common to all people.

Throughout this essay we have spoken mainly of general education "courses." Courses are, after all, the currency of academic life. But we would urge a broader view. General education objectives can be achieved in other ways as well. We know of several institutions where seminars are held in residence halls and in the student lounge. On other campuses, all-college convocations occur throughout the academic year. On these occasions, distinguished faculty and guest lecturers address topics that cut across the academic specialties.

We are also attracted to the idea of devoting the midyear term to general education. When the so-called 4-1-4 calendar was introduced about 20 years ago, it offered colleges a marvelous opportunity for innovation. Although hundreds of institutions now have such a calendar, the interterm is often simply a lightly disguised vacation period, or an interval filled with a grab bag of electives. With more careful planning, the mid-year term can, we believe, be used effectively for general education. It can be a time when faculty and students move beyond their narrow academic interests, focus on the broad themes of common learning, and engage in common discourse.

General education also may take place off campus. Recently, the nation's public broadcasting stations aired a British Broadcasting Corporation production called *Connections*. This captivating series vividly described how today's technologies can be traced to ideas and inventions of the past—many of which have long been forgotten. Stephen Boyer, fifteen at the time, was fascinated with the program, as were we all. What sparked Stephen's imagination were the linkages the series described. For the first time, relationships spanning decades, generations, even centuries, were revealed to him. He gained a new perspective on history and its relationship to life today.

Or again, in the Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C., there is a fascinating ten-minute film. At the beginning, a man is seen lying on a beach. Through lapse-time photography, the viewer quickly moves away from the man, away from the earth, and into the far galaxies of outer space. Stars are seen orbited by planets, revealing the intricate complexity and strange beauty of it all. And then, without warning, we start the journey home, coming back, again in quantum leaps, to where it all began. However, instead of stopping at the man lying on the beach, we move inside the skin, inside the human cell, traveling at the same speed as before. Once again great spaces and objects are discovered moving in exquisite patterns and designs. In a few brief minutes, we have gained breathtaking new perspectives. The wonder of outer space and inner space are discovered to be in some respects very much alike.

We do not suggest that informal seminars, film clips, or BBC productions are the keys to general education. Faculty and classrooms are still the heart of the enterprise. Ideas must be critically examined, values tested, isolated events placed in context, and this is what the campus and the classroom are uniquely equipped to do. We do suggest, however, that "teachers" outside the classroom can make a contribution to general education. Seminars, films, college convocations, and TV productions all may be helpful in introducing students vividly to issues of common learning.

We repeat: General education is not a single set of courses. It is a program with a clear objective, one that can be achieved in a variety of ways. And while there may be great flexibility in the process, it is the clarity of purpose that is crucial.

THE CLIMATE OF THE CAMPUS

The barriers to general education are formidable. They must be candidly acknowledged. It is well known that curriculum reform is never easy. It is also common knowledge that faculty members who devote themselves to general education are rare and frequently run the risk of losing touch with their disciplines. In addition, enrollment in general education courses has declined. These are not, however, irreversible trends.

Without being unduly optimistic, we believe significant changes are in the wind. The climate of the nation and its campuses is more supportive of common learning than in the recent past.

First, general education is consistent with the mood of the times. After the divisions of the 1960s and the self-preoccupation of the 1970s, many Americans are searching for a renewal of community. Second, general education is regarded as a valuable remedy for many of the perceived social and academic problems on the campuses and beyond—the Watergate morality, declining student academic performance, increasing undergraduate vocationalism and specialization, disinterest in the responsibilities of citizenship, and much more. Third, general education appears to be consistent with the institutional and professional self-interest of higher learning institutions. It is a way, some argue, to reduce the cost of instruction for colleges and to improve the teaching opportunities available to faculty and graduate students.

Historically, each of these conditions by itself has been sufficient for curriculum reform. But the simultaneous existence of all three is extraordinary and marks the present as a particularly propitious time for the strengthening of general education.

There is also evidence that students are more receptive to general education—perhaps even eager for it—than is generally supposed. A report by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education revealed that 97 percent of a representative sample of college students considered general education an "essential" or "fairly important" part of their college education.[21] And a sampling of this year's college freshmen ranked general education as one of the top three reasons for seeking higher education.[22]

But here's the point. Undergraduates also report that they are enormously dissatisfied with the general education programs their colleges now offer. In a recent study of ten representative institutions (four liberal arts colleges, four universities, a community college, and a technical institute), Jerry Gaff found that while 94 percent of the students wanted general education, only 20 percent were "very satisfied" with the general education classes they had taken. By way of comparison, at least twice as many students reported satisfaction with courses in their academic major and with electives.[23] In ever increasing numbers, they are choosing studies that will help them get a job.

Students are understandably concerned about the future. At the same time they continue to care deeply about the larger human issues and their relationship with others. They have not abandoned general education; general education has abandoned them. They reject the bankrupt system we now have. We are convinced that general education will be supported if a well-shaped program is constructed, and if authentic connections are made between the content of the program and the lives of students. Sister Eileen Rice, writing about teaching the humanities, made a point which applies equally, we believe, to general education:

> When students are asked to pursue an idea across disciplinary boundaries . . . , when they are asked to devise their own metaphors for the relationship of the disciplines to human experiences . . . , when they are asked to argue actively with one another and from both sides of the question on timeless issues, such as the relationship of the individual to the state; when they are asked to engage in hypothetical conversations with historical personages; when students are as actively involved—both intellectually and effectively—in the process of education as teachers are, then the humanities will have found a home with another generation.[24]

But what about the faculty? We have been reminded time and time again that faculty members are the key to everything we have discussed. A college may have a sense of purpose, and a curriculum may be carefully constructed, but in the end the faculty will determine the quality of general education. We have also been reminded that today's rewards go most frequently to those who teach and publish within the disciplines. A faculty member teaching general education may feel justifiably uneasy when he or she is reviewed for tenure and promotion. Desperation about career prospects forces many faculty to become even more narrowly committed to their core disciplines and less willing to take risks.

If these fears are to be overcome, institutional priorities must be reshaped. College presidents and deans must have convictions about general education and, through resource allocation, they must make those convictions clear. Senior teachers must be willing to teach a

general education course or two and give time to committees responsible for the development of such programs. They must be willing to encourage and then protect young faculty who take general education risks. Beyond the university, business and corporation leaders must not just pay lip service to the virtues of common learning; they must give credit for strong general education training when recruiting students. For those colleges still hiring, a greater institutional commitment to general education must be demonstrated when new faculty are recruited. Colleges must be more willing to bring in broadly-educated people who may have nontraditional credentials and who think in new, creative ways. When colleges promote, grant tenure, allocate raises, or decide about access to travel money, the "plus factor" for interest and competence in general education has to show.

The pressure to publish is real, as is the concern of faculty that they not be asked to abandon their field of expertise. Here again, however, there are hopeful signs. Recently we have visited campuses where faculty participation in general education is on the rise. A good example is a well-known eastern research university. In the high enrollment days of the 1960s, virtually no senior faculty member chose to participate in general education; junior staffers and the least able graduate students were unwillingly assigned to teach the course. Staff turnover each year was about 50 percent; morale was low and the quality of instruction continually poor. Students rated the course far below the university average. At one point, the history department even withdrew program support and refused to supply it with faculty.

This has changed. Faculty in liberal arts departments at this university now face declining enrollments. Even the best graduate students cannot get financial help. So both faculty members and graduate students are asking to teach Western civilization courses. In fact, the chairman of the history department, which has lost enrollment in recent years, is now director of the program.

To be sure, this is only one institution. But we have witnessed this shift in priorities at other colleges as well. Indeed, at several institutions faculty members show renewed interest in common learning because it is the one part of the curriculum where creative planning can still take place. As one faculty member put it, general education is the only home for experimentation remaining on campus. This may be the exception to be sure, and yet there is evidence that the enroll-

ment and fiscal squeeze are making general education more appealing to the faculty.

But faculty support for general education may reflect something more than adversity alone. The contours of the disciplines themselves are changing. New academic alliances are being formed. Interconnections between historically separate fields of study are emerging as inquiry on the frontiers of knowledge blend what traditionally have been isolated fields of study. Sociologists, psychologists, biologists, and chemists find themselves seeking answers to the same, or closely related questions. Humanists adopt some of the methods of the natural scientist and some of the perspectives of the social scientist, while scientists ponder issues humanists have reflected upon for centuries.

Anthropologist Clifford Geertz of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton has gone so far as to describe these shifts in the world of scholarship as "an important change in the way we *think* about the way we think." [Emphasis ours] This is reflected, Geertz says:

> . . . in philosophical inquiries that look like literary criticism (think of Stanley Cavell on Beckett or Thoreau, Sartre on Flaubert), scientific discussions that look like *belles lettres morceaux* (Lewis Thomas, Loren Eisley), baroque fantasies presented as straight forward empirical observations (Borges, Barthelme), or histories that consist of equations and tables or law court testimony (Fogel and Engerman, Le Roi Ladurie), documentaries that read like true confessions (Mailer), parables posing as ethnographies (Castenada), theoretical treatises set out as travelogues (Levi-Strauss), ideological arguments cast as historiographical inquiries (Edward Said), epistemological studies constructed like political tracts (Paul Feyerabend), methodological polemics got up as personal memoirs (James Watson).[25]

The wall dividing the two cultures—scientific and humane—is still standing, but it is being continuously breached; the pattern of intellectual investigation is being rearranged. More than at any time in our memory, researchers feel the need to communicate with colleagues in other fields. And this epistemological change may have profound

impact on the future of general education. As new investigative links are drawn, scholars at all levels will—of necessity—make new connections between their own disciplines and the disciplines of others. A more integrated view of knowledge and a focus on the larger questions in our teaching and research will create, we believe, a climate favorable to general education in the nation's colleges and schools.

Nearly forty years ago in *Liberal Education*, Mark Van Doren wrote:

> The connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his capacity. No human capacity is great enough to permit a vision of the world as simple, but if the educator does not aim at the vision no one else will, and the consequences are dire when no one does. . . . The student who can begin early in life to think of things as connected, even if he revises his view with every succeeding year, has begun the life of learning.[26]

Seeing "the connectedness of things," is, we conclude, the goal of common learning.

APPENDICES

RESEARCH STUDIES UNDERTAKEN FOR THIS ESSAY

IN PREPARATION for this volume, two major studies were carried out by the Carnegie Foundation. The first was an inquiry into the historical purposes of general education. The second was an analysis of the structure and content of general education at America's colleges and universities. The details of this research are discussed in the following appendices.

APPENDIX A

HISTORICAL PURPOSES OF GENERAL EDUCATION

WE BEGAN THIS STUDY by trying to clarify the meaning and purpose of general education. Toward this end, we examined the stated purposes for general education during times of widespread general education reform—the periods described earlier in this essay as revivals or movements. We studied the literature produced during each of this century's three revivals, focusing on 1918–1930, 1943–1955, and 1971–1981. By means of *Books in Print*, *The Readers Guide to Periodical Literature*, and the education indexes, we were able to identify the relevant writings. Considerably more than 90 percent of this material was located and read. We supplemented it with a variety of unpublished sources including bibliographies, speeches, and institutional reports. In short, we comprehensively surveyed the literature on general education produced during times when interest in the subject was most acute.

What we found included committee reports, accounts of institutional reforms, descriptions of new programs, philosophical statements,

commentaries on general education, news accounts, historical treatises, analyses of the curriculum position papers, and empirical studies. General education was defined in a variety of ways: in terms of subject matter, methodology, objectives, and goals. Our interest in the literature concentrated on the goals and objectives. We sought to find out why certain subject matter and methods were recommended and to learn what larger ends they were intended to achieve.

In the process, we discovered fifty different purposes for general education. Fourteen were associated with the first revival, twenty-one with the second, and fifteen with the third.

Purposes for general education cited during the World War I era revival (1910–1930)

1. To teach "citizenship" and respect for natural heritage—Ray, P. O. "The Ignorant 'Educated' and the Universities," *School and Society*, vol. 10, no. 249, October 4, 1919, p. 392.

2. To undermine "counter democratic" practices such as "bossism" and "machine politics"—Ibid., p. 388.

3. To overcome social abuses, such as the "Ku Klux Klan" and the 1919 red scare—Myers, W. S. "Know Nothing and Ku Klux Klan," *North American Review*, vol. 219, no. 818, July 1924, p. 4.

4. To integrate a swarm of newly arrived "immigrants" into the mainstream of their new country—Ray, P. O. "The Ignorant 'Educated' and the Universities," p. 389.

5. To reduce "individualism"—Farnam, H. W. "The Balance Wheels of America," *Yale Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, January 1919, p. 257.

6. To end the free "elective" system and overspecialization—Meiklejohn, A., *The Liberal Arts College* (New York, Arno Press, 1920) p. 113.

7. To add balance and "unity" to college curriculum—Usher, R. G. "The Fundamentals of an Education," *North American Review*, vol. 210, no. 769, p. 779.

8. To provide a global or "worldwide" perspective—"Academic Internationalism," *The Nation*, vol. 107, no. 2788, December 7, 1918, p. 693.

9. To bring back the national "solidarity" of the war years—Judd, C. H. "Industry and the Liberal Arts," *School and Society*, vol. 16, no. 409, October 28, 1922, p. 489.

10. To restore ethical and "moral" principles—Culten, G. B. "The Reconstruction of Democracy," *School and Society*, vol. 11, no. 268, February 1920, p. 489.

11. To encourage "idealism" and hope in the future—Callender, T. "The Hope of the Future," *North American Review*, vol. 215, no. 796, March 1922, p. 411.

12. To abate the clamor for relevance—Guth, W. W. "The Post-War Curriculum," *School and Society*, vol. 11, no. 268, February 1920, p. 186.

13. To put the world back together after the war—Ibid. p. 186.

14. To imitate prestige institutions such as Columbia and Harvard—"A New Educational Bill of Fate," *The Nation*, vol. 114, no. 2966, May 10, 1922, p. 557.

Purposes for General education cited during World War II era revival (1943–1955)

15. To train "citizens" and "human beings" for public responsibility—Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945) p. 51.

16. To educate people to a "common" heritage rather than their individual differences—Cowling, D. T., and Davidson, C. *Colleges for Freedom*, (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947) p. 44.

17. To help individuals "adapt" to society—Morton, M. "Regimentation, Advantages of," *Time Magazine*, vol. 47, no. 2, January 14, 1946, p. 59.

18. To develop "whole man."—Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945) p. 74.

19. To respond to the ravages of "war"—Morrill, J. L. "The Present Challenge to General Education," *General Education in Transition* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1951) p. 14.

20. To counteract communism or "Russia"—Koopman, G. "The Social Significance of the General Education Movement in 1948," *School and Society*, vol. 68, no. 1755, August 1948, p. 107.

21. To "educate for democracy"—"A Program in Adult Education," *The School Review*, vol. 54, no. 8, October 1946, p. 446.

22. To consolidate the young and the old—Brickman, W. W. "General Education," *The School Review*, vol. 69, no. 1783, February 1949, p. 134.

23. To combat the free "elective" system—"Dispute at the University of Chicago," *The Commonweal*, vol. 40, no. 8, June 9, 1944, p. 172.

24. To compensate for "vocational" training and major study—"The Need for Experimentation and Research," in Morse, H. T. (ed.), *General Education in Transition* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1951) p. 18.

25. To reduce overspecialization—"A Broad Curriculum for the Colleges," *School and Society*, vol. 69, no. 1775, January 1, 1949, p. 6.

26. To overcome ignorance of science—The President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1947) p. 52.

27. To encourage "creativity"—Monroe, W. S. "General Education," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (New York, MacMillan Company, 1950) p. 490.

28. To battle selfishness—Ibid., p. 490.

29. To build "basic skills"—Johnson, B. *General Education in Action* (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1952) p. 2.

30. To restore ethical and "moral" principles—MacLeish, A. "Education in Uniform: The Dilemna," *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 171, no. 2, February 1943, p. 39.

31. To help the nation promote mass higher education and create a coast-to-coast system of "junior colleges"—McGrath, E. J. "General Education: A Review," *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 2, no. 4, July 1948, p. 270.

32. To confront the problems of the post-war era—Puknot, S. "The Liberal Arts and the World Dilemna," *The Journal of General Education*, vol. 4, no. 2, January 1950, p. 131.

33. To integrate "veterans" into society—"Old Campuses, New Faces," *The Saturday Review of Literature*, vol. 29, no. 39, September 1946, p. 12.

34. To provide a global or "world" perspective—Duggan, S. "Education Under the New Order," *The Saturday Review of Literature*, vol. 28, no. 37, September 1945, p. 7.

35. To share the prestige of the new "Harvard" curriculum—"Now, the Harvard Plan," *Newsweek*, vol. 26, no. 6, August 6, 1945, p. 80.

Purposes of General Education cited during the current era (1971–1981)

36. To respond to the post-Watergate mood by providing ethical and "value" training and leadership—Mohrman, K. (ed.), *The Forum of Liberal Education*, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., March 1978, p. 5.

37. To develop a "world" or global perspective—Faculty of Arts and Sciences,

Harvard University, *Report on the Core Curriculum*, February 15, 1978, p. 4.

38. To combat the new narcissism and "self-centeredness"—*The Core Curriculum of St. Joseph's College* (Rensselaer, Indiana, St. Joseph's College, 1977).

39. To overcome the current "cultural crisis" and reassert a common national heritage—Botstein, L. "A Proper Education," *Harper's* vol. 259, no. 259, September 1979, p. 34.

40. To strengthen essential "skills"—Travis, T. J., Facione, A. and Litwin, J. "Beyond the Core Curriculum: An Outcomes Approach to General Education," *Liberal Education*, vol. 64, no. 7, December 1978, p. 440.

41. To counter the new vocationalism by "uniting liberal and professional learning"—Meyerson, M., "Civilizing Education: Uniting Liberal and Professional Learning," *Daedalus*, vol. 103, no. 4, Fall 1974, p. 175.

42. To serve as an antidote to overspecialization—Belknap, L. and Kuhns, R. *Tradition and Innovation*, (New York, Columbia University Press, 1977) p. 3.

43. To counter a curriculum imbalance that favors electives over requirements – Fairlie, H. "The Trivialization of a Harvard Education," *The Washington Post*, March 5, 1978, p. C-8.

44. To make use of under-utilized faculty—Hartman, T. "Developing a Core Curriculum," *The Forum for Liberal Education* October 1977.

45. To "reduce the costs of instruction" with a common core curriculum—Walsh, J. "Harvard, Science, and the Company of Educated Men and Women," *Science*, vol. 202, no. 8, December 1978, p. 1065.

46. To improve the quality of teaching—Ibid., p. 1065.

47. To share in the glow of Harvard's general education—Maher, T. "Introduction—General Education and Harvard: A Plea for Conversation," "Congratulations. But . . .," *American Association for Higher Education Bulletin*, vol. 31, no. 1, September 1978, p. 3.

48. To prop up public confidence in higher education—Bailey, S. K., *The Purposes of Education* (Bloomington, Phi Delta Kappan, 1976).

49. To "screen out non-traditional less well-prepared students from higher education"—Levine, A. "General Education: Aid to a Disaster Area," American Association of Colleges, Denver, May 1980.

50. To improve an institution's marketing position—Rudolph, F. "Dirty Words, Leadership and Liberal Learning," *Change Magazine*, vol. 12, no. 3, April 1980, p. 20.

At first glance, this list of purposes appeared to us to be without form or substance—a clutter of confused and unrelated goals. During one reform era, general education was a way of integrating immigrants into the society. During the next, it was a means of integrating veterans into the society. And in a third, it was a vehicle for integrating single-interest groups into the society. General education seemed to be whatever society wanted it to be at any given time.

A more careful look, however, suggested a pattern. While some purposes seemed more significant to us than others, it appeared that, beneath the surface, general education's purposes divided themselves roughly into two groups: first, those that promote social integration; and second, those that combat social disintegration—two sides of the same coin.

There are, of course, a handful of other goals that do not fit the pattern. Some, such as institutional prestige and improving public confidence, were clearly only window dressing. Others, such as cutting cost and establishing a better marketing position, had more to do with economics than education. However, we were impressed that the vast majority of general education purposes do seem to fit into the two categories identified above. This is shown in Chart 1.

We were also impressed by the continuity from revival to revival. All three general education movements seem to have appeared at times when a common set of values was promoted—the preservation of democracy, the sharing of citizen responsibility, the commitment to ethical and moral behavior, the enhancement of global perspectives, and the integration of diverse groups into the larger society. They also sought to eliminate a common set of perceived ills—overspecialization, free electives, vocationalism, unethical conduct, selfishness, and anti-democratic behavior. The three revivals moved in the direction of community, and away from fragmentation. The emphasis appeared consistently to be on shared values, shared heritage, shared responsibilities, shared governance, and a shared world vision.

In short, general education seemed to have an historically certain purpose. It seemed to us to embrace those experiences, problems, relationships, ethical concerns, and sources of conflict that are common to all of us simply by virtue of our membership in the human family and in a particular society, at a given moment in history. Placed in historical context, general education appears to us to be an educational reaffirmation of the social bond that joins all people.

CHART I

THE STATED PURPOSES OF GENERAL EDUCATION
THROUGH THREE NATIONAL REVIVALS

To Promote Social Integration	WWI	WWII	*Current*
Sharing Humankind's Common Heritage	•	•	•
Enhancing Global Perspectives	•	•	•
Developing Mutual Responsibility	•	•	•
• TEACH CITIZENS PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY	•	•	
• SOLVE COMMON PROBLEMS		•	•
Preserving a Democratic Society	•	•	•
• EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY	•	•	
• PRIDE IN CITIZENSHIP			•
Making Commitment to Moral and Ethical Behavior	•	•	•
Integrating Diverse Groups into Larger Society	•	•	•
• IMMIGRANTS	•		
• YOUNG AND OLD		•	
• JUNIOR COLLEGES		•	
• VETERANS		•	
• SINGLE INTEREST GROUPS			•
Reconstructing Society After War	•	•	•
Other			
• ENCOURAGE IDEALISM	•		
• NATIONAL SOLIDARITY	•		
• GOOD LIFE	•	•	
• HELP INDIVIDUAL ADAPT TO SOCIETY		•	
• PROMOTE MASS EDUCATION		•	
• DEVELOP WHOLE PERSON		•	•

To Combat Social Disintegration	*WW I*	*WW II*	*Current*
Overcoming Anti-Democratic Behavior	•	•	•
• KU KLUX KLAN	•		
• MACHINE POLITICS	•		
• BOSSISM	•		
• RED SCARE, COMMUNISM	•	•	
• WATERGATE		•	•
Eliminating Educational Practices Catering to Individual Differences	•	•	•
• CURRICULUM IMBALANCE	•		
• OVERSPECIALIZATION	•	•	•
• VOCATIONALISM	•	•	•
• OVERELECTION OF CURRICULUM	•	•	•
• DECLINE OF BASIC SKILLS		•	•
• POOR QUALITY OF TEACHING			•
Avoiding Unethical and Immoral Behavior	•	•	•
Reducing Asocial Behavior	•	•	•
• OVER INDIVIDUALISM	•	•	
• SELFISHNESS		•	
• MEISM/SELF CENTEREDNESS			•
Counteracting "Life For Today" Orientation			
• RELEVANCE	•		
• IGNORANCE OF SCIENCE AND CREATIVITY		•	
• NEW NARCISSISM			•
Other			
• OVERCOME CULTURAL CONFUSION			•

Other	*New I*	*New II*	*Current*
Increase Institutional Prestige	•	•	•
Promote Community Colleges		•	
Employ Underemployed Faculty			•
Reduce Costs of Instruction			•
Prop Up Public Confidence in Education			•
Screen Out Nontraditional Students			•
Improve Marketing Position of Colleges			•

APPENDIX B

THE STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION

TO COMPREHEND THE STATE of current general education practice, we examined general education requirements at a representative sample of two- and four-year colleges and universities. Using the well-known Carnegie typology, we analyzed a stratified sample of 309 institutional catalogs for the year 1980. We focused on the proportion of the total college program required for general education, the subjects that constitute the general education curriculum, the elements incorporated in the curriculum (e.g. disciplinary courses, interdisciplinary courses, great books, and freshmen seminars), and the overall design of the program (cores, distributions, electives, competencies, and the like).

The following institutions, listed alphabetically by Carnegie typology, were included in the catalog study:

Public Research Universities I
University of California at San Diego
Colorado State University
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
University of Iowa
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Ohio State University

Oregon State University
Purdue University
University of Utah

Private Research Universities I
Boston University
California Institute of Technology
Columbia University
Cornell University
Duke University
Johns Hopkins University
Northwestern University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Rochester
University of Southern California
Washington University
Yeshiva University

Public Research Universities II
Auburn University
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut at Storrs
Florida State University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
University of Kansas
State University of New York at Buffalo
University of Oklahoma at Norman
University of Oregon
University of Vermont
University of Virginia

Private Research Universities II
Brandeis University
Brown University
Catholic University of America
Emory University
Georgetown University
George Washington University
Howard University
St. Louis University
Syracuse University
Temple University
Tufts University
Tulane University
Vanderbilt University

Public Doctorate-granting Universities I
University of Alabama
University of Delaware
University of Idaho
Kent State University
University of Maine
University of Missouri at Kansas City
University of North Dakota
Northern Illinois University
North Texas State University
Ohio University
University of South Carolina
Southern Methodist University
University of Southern Mississippi
Texas Tech University
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

Private Doctorate-granting Universities I
American University
Boston College
Brigham Young University
Dartmouth College
University of Denver
Fordham University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Lehigh University
Marquette University
Northeastern University
University of Notre Dame
University of the Pacific
Rice University

Public Doctorate-granting Universities II
University of Akron
University of Alaska
Bowling Green State University
College of William and Mary
East Texas University
Idaho State University
Illinois State University
Memphis State University
Miami University of Ohio
University of Nevada at Reno
North Dakota State University
University of Southern Florida
Texas Woman's University
Western Michigan University

Private Doctorate-granting Universities II

Adelphi University
Clark University
University of Detroit
New School for Social Research
Texas Christian University
United States International University

Public Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I

Alcorn State University
Appalachian State University
Armstrong State College
Bemidji State University
California Polytechnic State University
California State University at Chico
Central Michigan University
Cleveland State University
East New Mexico University
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Framingham State College
Georgia Southwestern College
Kansas State College at Pittsburg
Kearney State College
Kutztown State College
Lake Superior State College
Louisiana Tech University
McNeese State University
Minot State College
University of New Orleans
State University of New York at Fredonia
Nicholls State University
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of Northern Iowa
Northern Louisiana University
Oakland University
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
Prairie View A. and M. University
Rutgers University at Camden
Savannah State College
Shippensburg State College
Tarleton State University
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Virginia State College
Western Georgia College
Winona State University
University of Wisconsin at Whitewater

Private Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I

Duquesne University
Elmira College
Fairfield University
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Grove City College
University of Hartford
Manhattan College
University of Portland
Russell Sage College
Saint Olaf College
Saint Peter's College
University of San Francisco
Seattle Pacific University
Seattle University
Simmons College
Suffolk University
Valparaiso University

Public Comprehensive Colleges and Universities II

California State College at Stanislaus
Glassboro State College
University of North Carolina at Asheville
Johnson State College
Lander College
Lyndon State College
Lewis and Clark College
University of Maryland at Baltimore County
Western New Mexico University
State University of New York at Cortland
Virginia Military Institute
Central Washington University
Wayne State College
Worcester State College

Private Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II

Antioch College
Aquinas College
Bloomfield College
Calvin College

Hardin-Simmons University
Illinois Wesleyan University
Jacksonville University
King's College of New York
King's College Pennsylvania
LeMoyne College
Luther College
College of New Rochelle
Oklahoma Baptist University
East Oregon State University
University of Redlands
Sacred Heart University
Saint Anselm's College
Saint Augustine's College
College of Saint Benedict
Saint John Fisher College
Saint Lawrence University
Saint Michael's College
Saint Norbert College
Saint Xavier College
University of Tampa
Upsala College
West Virginia Wesleyan University
Walla Walla College
Whittier College

Private Liberal Arts Colleges I
Agnes Scott College
Beloit College
Bowdoin College
Central College
Davidson College
Goucher College
Hamilton College
Hampden-Sydney College
Hartwick College
Hobart-William Smith Colleges
Manhattanville College
Muhlenberg College
Ripon College
Southwestern at Memphis
Sweet Briar College
Washington and Jefferson College

Public Liberal Arts Colleges II
College of Charleston
Evergreen State College
University of Maine at Machias

Private Liberal Arts Colleges II
Adrian College
Albertus Magnus College
Alma College
Azusa Pacific College
Bethel College
Brescia College
Briarcliff College
Concordia College at St. Paul, Minnesota
Concordia Teachers' College (NE)
Findlay College
Friends World College
Georgetown College
Grand View College
Green Mountain College
Huron College
Jarvis Christian College
The King's College at New York
Lycoming College
Marietta College
Marymount College
Mount Union College
Queens College
Roger Williams College
Rosemont College
Salem College
Southwestern University
Spertus College of Judaica
Spring Arbor College
Wayland Baptist College
C. Wesleyan College
Wheeling College
Wilmington College

Public Two-Year Colleges and Institutes
American River College
Arizona West College
Bellevue Community College
Blue Mountain Community College
Brevard Community College
Brunswick Junior College
Bucks County Community College
Charles County Community College
Clackamas Community College
Conners State College
Cowley County Community College
Diablo Valley College
Dixie College

Eastern Shore Community College
Grand Rapids Community College
Hagerstown Community College
Highline Community College
Hutchinson Community College
Iowa Lakes Community College
Los Angeles City College
Manatee Junior College
Metropolitan Community College
Miami-Dade Community College
Middlesex Community College
University of Minnesota Technical Institute
Modesto Community College
Monroe Community College
Natchez Junior College
Orange Coast College
Orange County Community College
Porterville College
Riverside City College
Rockland Community College
Sante Fe Community College
Schoolcraft College
Suffolk County Community College
Tacoma Community College
Trinidad State College
Westchester Community College
Worthington Community College

Private Two-Year Colleges and Institutes
Bay Path Junior College
Cape Cod Community College
Cazenovia College
Central YMCA Community College
Dean Junior College
Harcum Junior College
Keystone Junior College
Lasell Junior College
Lees-McRae College
Lockyear College
MacCormac College
Mary Holmes College
Montreat-Anderson College
Ohio Valley College
Presentation College
Ricks College
Southern Ohio College
Southwestern Christian College
Suomi College
Truett McConnell College
Union College
Villa Julie College
Villa Maria College of Buffalo
Wesley College

NOTES

I. THE TALE OF THE SPARE ROOM

1. Thomas, R. *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education: 1800-1970* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962) pp. 11, 53, 59, 68; Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1945) Bell, D. *The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in its National Setting* (Garden City, N.Y., Anchor Books, 1968).

II. A SUCCESSION OF REVIVALS

1. "Coming Apart," *New York Times*, April 14, 1976, Sect. IV, p. 14.

2. O'Connell, B. "Where Does Harvard Lead Us?" *Change Magazine*, September, 1978, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 35–40; American Association for Higher Education, "Congratulations But . . ." *AAHE Bulletin*, September, 1978, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 3–7; Shulman, C. I., "Revamping Core Curricula," *AAHE Bulletin*, vol. 31, no. 9 May 1979, pp. 3–7.

3. Fairlie, H. "The Trivialization of a Harvard Education," *Washington Post*, March 5, 1978, p. C-8; Simmons, A. "Harvard Flunks a Test," *Harper's*, vol. 258, no. 1546, March 1979, pp. 20–27; Schiefelbein, S. "Confusion at Harvard: What Makes an 'Educated' Man," *Saturday Review*, vol. 5, no. 3, April 1, 1978, pp. 12–20.

4. Gaff, J. *General Education: Issues and Resources* (Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges, 1980) p. 22; Mohrman, K. (ed.). *The Forum of Liberal Education* (Washington, D.C., Association of American Colleges) March 1978, p. 5.

5. Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, "Report on the Core Curriculum," February 15, 1978, p. 4.

6. Lasch, C. *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1978) pp. 4–5.

7. Travis, T., Facione, P., and Litwin, J. "Beyond the Core Curriculum: An Outcomes Approach to General Education," *Liberal Education*, vol. 64, no. 7, December, 1978, p. 440.

8. Meyerson, M. "Civilizing Education: Uniting Liberal and Professional Education," *Daedalus*, vol. 103, no. 4, Fall 1974; Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Berkeley: Carnegie Surveys, 1978 (unpublished); Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Undergraduate Survey, 1969 (unpublished).

9. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Berkeley: Carnegie Surveys, 1978 (unpublished); Belknap, R. and Kuhns, R. *Traditions and Innovation* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1977); Fairlie, "The Trivialization of a Harvard Education," C-8.

10. Hartman, D. "Developing a Core Curriculum," *Forum for Liberal Education*, October 1977; Walsh, J. "Harvard, Science, and the Company of Educated Men and Women," *Science*, vol. 202, no. 8, December 1978, p. 1065.

11. Brubacher, J. and Rudy, W. *Higher Education in Transition* (New York, Harper and Row, 1976) p. 272.

12. Columbia University Catalog, 1919–20.

13. Leuchtenburg, W. *The Perils of Prosperity 1914–32* (Chicago, University of Chicago, 1958) p. 174.

14. Allen, F. *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920's* (New York, Harper and Row, 1964) pp. 103–104.

15. Draper, H. "The Student Movement of the Thirties" in *As We Saw the Thirties: Essays on Social and Political Movements of a Decade*, Simon, R. (ed.). (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1969) p. 156.

16. Goulden, J. *The Best Years: 1945–1950*, (New York, Atheneum, 1976) pp. 427–428.

17. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975) Part 1, pp. 316–319.

18. Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945).

19. Dressel, P. and Delisle, F. *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends* (Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1969).

20. Blackburn, R. and others, *Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education*, (Berkeley, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976).

III. A ROOM WITH A PURPOSE

1. Van Doren, M. *Liberal Education* (New York, Henry Holt, 1943) p. 115.

2. Levine, A. *When Dreams and Heroes Died: A Profile of Today's College Student* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980) p. 13.

3. *The Stanford Observer*, February 1976, p. 1.

4. Thomas, L. *The Medusa and the Snail: More Notes of a Biology Watcher* (New York, The Viking Press, 1979) p. 145.

IV. A LOOK AT CURRENT PRACTICE

1. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Catalog Study (unpublished) See Appendix B for details.

2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. 4. Ibid. 5. Ibid. 6. Ibid. 7. Ibid.

8. Faculty of Yale University, "Yale Report of 1828" in Hofstadter, R. and Smith, W. *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961), vol. 1, pp. 277–291.

9. Rudolph, F. *The American College and University: A History* (New York, Vantage, 1962) p. 296.

10. Eliot, C. *A Turning Point in Higher Education: The Inaugural Address of Charles William Eliot As President of Harvard University*, October 19, 1869 (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1969).

11. Harvard College "New England's First Fruits," 1642, in Morison, S., *The Founding of Harvard College* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945) pp. 432–436.

12. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Catalog Study (unpublished) see Appendix B for details.

13. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions* (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977) p. 11.

V. A PROPOSAL

1. Einstein, A. *Out of My Later Years* (New York, Philosophical Library, 1950) p. 112.

2. Wiener, N. *The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society* (Boston, Avon Books, 1967) p. 25.

3. Carnegie Foundation Catalog Study, 1980. See Appendix B for details.

4. Sidlin, M. "Someone's Priority" (Aspen, Colorado, Colorado Department of Education, 1978) mimeographed.

5. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *Carnegie Council National Surveys 1975–1976: Undergraduate Marginals*, vol. 3 (Berkeley, Carnegie Council, 1978).

6. Evans, C. *The Micro Millenium* (New York, The Viking Press, 1979) p. 106.

7. *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, Emerson, E. W. and Forbes, W. E. (eds.) (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909) vol. 2, p. 448.

8. Park, R. E. *Human Communities* (Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1952) p. 66.

9. Carnegie Foundation Catalog Study, 1980. See Appendix B for additional details.

10. Shaw, G. B., in *Bernard Shaw: Complete Plays with Prefaces*, (New York, Dodd Mead, 1942) vol. III, p. 204.

11. Carnegie Foundation Catalog Study, 1980. See Appendix B for additional details.

12. Thomas, L. "On the Uncertainty of Science," *Harvard Magazine*, September-October 1980, p. 21.

13. Carnegie Foundation Catalog Study, 1980. See Appendix B for additional details.

14. Clouser, K. D. *The Role of the Humanities in Medical Education* (Norfolk, Teagle and Little, Inc., 1978) p. 28.

15. Harvard Committee Report, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945) pp. 190–191.

16. Snow, C. P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1959) p. 4.

17. Carnegie Foundation Catalog Study, 1980. See Appendix B for details.

18. Eliot, T. S. "Burnt Norton" in *T. S. Eliot: The Complete Poems and Plays* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1952) p. 117.

19. Personal communication.

20. Russell, B. *Authority and the Individual* (New York, Simon and Shuster, 1949) p. 70.

21. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1978.

22. Astin, A. W. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1980*, (Los Angeles, American Council on Education and University of California at Los Angeles, 1981).

23. Gaff, J. *Project on General Education Models: GEM Newsletter*, Washington, D.C., no. 5, September 1980, pp. 1–8.

24. Rice, E. "Students: The Missing Variable," *AAHE Bulletin*, vol. 33, no. 3, November 1980, pp. 1–3.

25. Geertz, C. "Balanced Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought," *American Scholar*, Spring 1980, vol. 49, no. 2, p. 165–166.

26. Van Doren, M. *Liberal Education* (New York, Henry Holt, 1943) p. 115.